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## ABSTRACT

This research effort continues the investigation started by Leshko and Vosseteig (1975) in the utilization of situational stimuli to identify and measure executive capacity. Expanded hypothesis testing relating to the executive capacity indicators isolated by Leshko and Vosseteig was conducted. The data base was comprised of sample populations of executives from the private and public sectors, and middle managers from the public sector. These populations were compared with one another, and then compared individually, and collectively, with the executive success criteria described in management literature. Analysis of the data showed that the private executives differed significantly from both the public executives and middle managers on all capacity indicators tested except health, job security, and family relationships. When the sample populations were compared with expected responses based on management literature, only health and family relationships indicators show a significant similarity with the answer expected.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

PAGE
I. INTRODUCTION. ..... 8
A. BACKGROUND ..... 9
B. OBJECTIVES ..... 10
C. SCOPE. ..... 11
D. HYPOTHESIS ..... 12
II. METHODOLOGY ..... 13
III. LITERATURE INVESTIGATION. ..... 13
IV. SELECTION OF CAPACITY INDICATORS ..... 14
V. DEVELOPMENT OF EXPANDED TEST INSTRUMENT ..... 17
A. BASIS FOR DEVELOPMENT OF QUESTIONS ..... 17
B. INSTRUMENT PRE-TEST. ..... 28
C. EXPECTED VALUES FROM LITERATURE. ..... 28
VI. ADMINISTRATION OF TEST INSTRUMENT ..... 29
A. DEFINING POPULATIONS ..... 29
B. SAMPLING PROCEDURES. ..... 29
C. SURVEY METHOD. ..... 30
VII. DATA ANALYSIS ..... 31
A. RESPONSES. ..... 31
B. AUTOMATIC DATA PROCESSING PREPARATION AND UTILIZATION. ..... 31
C. ANALYSIS RESULTS ..... 32
VII. CONCLUSIONS ..... 38
IX. RECOMMENDATIONS ..... 39

APPENDIX A - DEFINITION OF KEY TERMS ..... 41
APPENDIX B - QUESTION DEVELOPMENT BY LESHKO AND VOSSETEIG ..... 43
APPENDIX C - EXECUTIVE JUDGMENTAL PERCEPTIONS QUESTIONNAIRE ..... 64
APPENDIX D - DATA CARD LAYOUT, KEYPUNCH INSTRUCTIONS AND CODING ..... 65
APPENDIX E - POPULATION DATA HISTOGRAMS ..... 82
APPENDIX F - INDIVIDUAL QUESTION ANALYSIS ..... 160
BIBLIOGRAPHY. ..... 174
INITIAL DISTRIBUTION LIST ..... 180

## LIST OF TABLES

| TABLE | TITLE PAGE |
| :---: | :---: |
| 1 | List of Capacity Indicators . . . . . . . . . 15 |
| 2 | Capacity Indicators Investigated . . . . . . . 16 |
| 3 | Comparison of Capacity Indicators to Management Literature by Population . . . . . 34 |
| 4 | Comparison of Capacity Indicator <br> Response by Population . . . . . . . . . . . . 36 |

## I. INTRODUCTION

A company's future success depends to a great extent on management's ability to identify, select, and develop individuals who have high potential for becoming successful future executives (Flory, 1971). Identification of executive capacity early in an employee's career is desirable to provide adequate lead time for thorough development and appraisal, at the lowest possible investment, before selection for executive responsibilities must be made.

Research has been conducted which utilized situational stimuli (See APPENDIX A) in the form of a questionnaire in an attempt to identify executive capacity indicators (Leshko and Vosseteig, 1975, Freeman and Motta, 1975, and Blake and Moulton, 1969).

The authors are of the opinion that situational stimuli in the form of a suitable questionnaire can be utilized to identify potential executive capacity, and that attempts should be made to develop suitable instruments to do so.

This thesis continues the investigation of capacity indicators compiled and studied by Leshko and Vosseteig (1975). Additional capacity indicators were identified, an expanded instrument utilizing situational stimuli was developed and administered to three executive populations, and responses to the instrument were analyzed.

## A. BACKGROUND

A review of management literature caused the authors to believe that identification of potential executives at an early stage can result in extensive benefits to an organization, including:

1. Recognition of the pool of talent from which future executives will be drawn.
2. A greater return on investment in personnel development programs.
3. A means for planning selective promotion of management personnel to executive positions commensurate with their individual capacity.
4. A longer period of time for development of executives by means of formal and on-the-job training.
5. Thorough appraisal to avoid the..."Peter Principle - In a heirarchy every employee tends to rise to his maximum level of incompetence," (Peter and Hull, 1969).
6. Reduced loss of high-potential employees to competing employers.
7. Improved motivation of potential executives.
8. Better long-term managerial performance.

A najor difficulty in identifying potential executives is the lack of discriminating indicators of executive success. Research of managerial literature and discussions with senior executives indicates that multiple selection criteria are normally used to predict managerial potential. No specific personality type, leaderahip style, psychometric prediction, or mixture of knowledge, skill and experience has been proven to be conclusive in identifying executive capability.
"It does little good to say that the manager must have patience, be a skillful persuader, and learn his way around an organization that bears little resemblance to the chart that has been drawn up to represent it. Rather, we need some objective conceptual means of describing these types of managerial positions in terms that have substance and more operationality than 'the ability to get along with people'," (Sayles, 1964, p. 45).

## B. OBJECTIVES

पhat basic objective of this thesis is to provide a means for early identification of potential executive talent. Secondary objectives include:

1. Determination of appropriate executive capacity indicators.
2. Validation of selected capacity indicators as a means of Deasuring executive characteristics.
3. Development of an appropriate instrument for use in identification of individuals with high potential as future executives.
C. SCOPE

This thesis provides details of an investigation which utilized a questionnaire based on situational stimuli to evaluate response patterns of successful executives in top management within industry, and in top and middle management within the federal civilian service sector of the government. Comparison of response patterns between the various populations is provided and executive capacity indicators are defined.

Leshko and Vosseteig (1975) provided the basis for this thesis in their work which isolated specific executive capacity indicators and evaluated their validity by means of a test instrument which was administered to successful executives. They demonstrated the feasibility of using situational stimuli as a means to assess executive capacity indicators. They tested nine indicators by administering their test instrument to two populations, senior civil service and industrial executives. They developed a new technique for executive capacity measurement.

The authors considered that the Leshko and Vosseteig work made a valuable contribution to the identification of potential executives, and utilized the situational stimuli approach to measure five additional capacity indicators: Reaction to conflict, ability under stress, desire for power, courage to commit resources, and intuition. These indicators, combined with the nine previously tested, provided a broader, more complete baseline for describing what executives do. Recommendations on the scope of future research are provided.

## D. BASIC HYPOTHESES

This thesis was based on the following hypotheses:

1. Relevant executive capacity indicators can be identified.
2. Executive capacity indicators can be measured by responses to situational stimuli.
3. A questionnaire can be developed which will validate selected capacity indicators.
4. Top management decision alternatives cannot be predicted by existing literature.
5. Middle and lower management decision alternatives can be predicted by existing literaure.
6. Senior executives in private and public sectors respond similarly to situational stimuli.
7. Response patteris of executives can be used as a baseline in evaluating potential executives.

Leshko and Vosseteig (1975) provided findings that support hypothesis 4 for combined remonses from executives in the private and public sectors. Tests were not performed on the separate populations. They rejected hypothesis 6 noting differences in responses, but did not elaborate on the reasons for the differences. In addition, they provided some evidence to support hypotheses 1, 2, 3, and 7, acknowledging that their data base was statistically insufficient for testing.

The authors' plan was to continue to investigate all the above hypotheses, with primary emphasis placed on hypotheses 4, 5, and 6 .

## II. METHODOLOGY

The basic procedural method utilized in this study consists of the following:

1. Literature Investigation - ascertain the contributions of others on the subject of identification of executive traits and characteristics.
2. Selection of Capacity Indicators - determine the executive capacity indicators to be evaluated.
3. Development of the Expanded Test Instrument - develop questions based on situational stimuli to evaluate executive capacity indicators.
4. Administration of Test Instrument - administer test instrument to selected populations in the public and private sectors.
5. Data Analysis - analyze response data to test hypotheses.

## III. LITERATURE INVESTIGATION

Current management literature makes frequent reference to the use of expensive assessment centers (Byham and Patterson, 1970), along with various psychological and other related appraisal methods for identification and development of potential executives. While the merit of these techniques is not disputed, the authors opine that an inexpensive situational analysis approach can be utilized as an
adjunctive tool in the identification of individuals with executive potential. Accordingly, attention in this thesis is directed toward furtherance of this approach.

An extensive search of managment Literature supports the completeness of an existing list of trait indicators (Leshko and Vosseteig, 1975, p. 21).

## IV. SELECTION OF CAPACITY INDICATORS

The authors conferred with experts in the field of management to verify the need, and the approach to be taken, in further research into the use of situational stymuli as a means for identification of potential executives. Primary conferees consisted of: Professor J. W. Creighton, Naval Postgraduate School, Monterey (NPS); Professor J. j~11y, NPS; Professor Laner, briver ity of California, Berkeley; Professor J. Kiley, NPS; Capt. E. W. Melvin, USN; Cmdr. T. J. Leshko, USN; and Lt. C. E. Vosseteig, US\%. There was general consensus that further research should orole 1 swarding and beneficial in the continuing search for effective vath alt the identification of executive potential. This approach wat further substantiated by members of the Naval Aviation Executive Institute sponsored Executive Management Program at the School.

The authors compiled a list of capacity indicators which were + sted by Leshko and Vosseteig (1975) utilizing the situational analysis method, and a list which were not tested. These are shown in Table 1.

## LIST OF CAPACITY INDICATORS ${ }^{1}$

PREVIOUSLY TESTED
Decision-Making Capability
Communicative Ability
Innovativeness
Ability to Manage Time
Psyche/Ego/Status
Health
Rewarding Family Life
Job Security
Mobility
NOT PREVIOUSLY TESTED
Planning Capability
Leadership Ability
Upward Mobility
Personality
Intelligence
Courage to Commit Resources
Ability Under Stress
Reaction to Conflict
Desire for Power
Intuition
${ }^{1}$ Traits and characteristics of executives as described in management literature have been grouped together as capacity indicators. Previously tested indicators were examined by Leshko and Vosseteig (1975). Explanation of untested indicators is given in the text which follows.

Several of the previously untested indicators shown in Table 1 were eliminated for the following reasons:

Planning ability was considered to be acquired during the normal development of an executive and not necessarily inherent in the individual; therefore, it was not considered to be measurable utilizing the situational analysis method. In addition, "Nobody has found important patterns in the way managers schedule their time," (Mintzberg, 1975, p. 51).

Leadership ability was eliminated from consideration due to extensive testing of this trait by other methods. It did not appear suitable for measurement by situational analysis since "there are no provable generalizations about leadership," (Bennis, 1975, p. 34).

Upward mobility was not included since most executives, as such, are at the top of their professions or business; thus have displayed this in their ascendancy. No suitable means for testing upward mobility using situational stimuli was identified.

The personality and intelligence indicators were not considered conducive to measurement by questionnaire.

Thus, out of the capacity indicators not previously tested by Leshko and Vosseteig, only those listed in Table 2 were considered for future investigation (in addition to those listed as previously tested in Table 1) in this thesis.

## TABLE 2

## CAPACITY INDICATORS INVESTIGATED ${ }^{1}$

Ability Under Stress
Reaction to Conflict
Desire for Power
Intuition
Courage to Commit Resources
${ }^{1}$ These five capacity indicators (specific executive success criteria) were determined suitable for testing utilizing situational stimuli. Management literature investigation, to isolate appropriate sizauli. was accomplished.

## V. DEVELOPMENT OF EXPANDED TEST INSTRUMENT

A test instrument was developed to measure executive capacity indicators utilizing the situational stimuli response method. The complete instrument is included within APPENDIX C.

Sections I and II of the instrument were taken verbatim from the instrument developed by Leshko and Vosseteig (1975), to permit utilization of primary data already gathered, and to preclude introduction of changes in the instrument which could invalidate these data. These sections measure the capacity indicators previously tested by Leshko and Vosseteig (1975, p. 44) (See Table 1).
A. BASIS FOR QUESTION DEVELOPMENT

The questions in all sections of the test instrument were designed to test how an individual would respond to situational stimuli; and, as such, are indicators of capacity. Sections I and II (Questions 1-49) of the test instrument were developed by Leshko and Vosseteig (1975). The questions and the basis for their development are provided in APPENDIX B. Section III (Questions $50-67$ ) was based upon the authors' interpretation of management literature. Following are the questions, grouped together by capacity indicators (Table 2) for ease in referencing:

1. Ability Under Stress

Questions 50,55 and 59 in the instrument were designed to display an individual's ability to make decisions under stressful conditions characterized by personal strain, tension or pressure in varying intensities. These questions are based on the assumption that successful executives openly deal with stress (Levinson, 1970; Batten, 1963), have developed means of working under pressure (Uris, 1957, p. 278; Albers, 1969) and do not resist organizationally desired change; are very calm and stable amidst stress (Flory, 1971; Levinson, 1970, p. 272). Question 50 - You have decided to terminate a company executive who is a personal friend. Which best describes what you would do?
a. Discuss the matter with him over the telephone.
b. Delegate the act of termination to someone else.
c. Delay notification until an opportune time.
d. Write a memo specifying the termination and its reasons.
e. Discuss the matter with him directly.

Question 55 - Indicate the one best description of your actions while working under tight time constraints for a considerable period.
a. You delegate part of your tasks.
b. You continually seek additional tasks to be performed.
c. You set aside part of the work for another time.
d. You set up a priority for the tasks, then follow the priority.
e. You are still open to ideas for additional tasks.

Question 59 - You and several others have been competing for the Chief Executive Office (CEO) position, which you confidently expected to receive and highly desire. You were just informed that a young "tiger" has been selected for the position, and you consider him to be less competent than you. You have received a memo from the retiring CEO to bring the new CEO up to speed. What would you do?
a. Resign.
b. Give token conformance and let the new CEO meet the challenge on his own.
c. Accept the assignment.
d. Take time off to think about the situation.
e. Accept the assignment, while looking for a position in another company.

## 2. Reaction to Conflict

Questions 51, 52 and 58 in the instrument were designed to show an individual's ability to handle conflict situations.

These questions are based on the assumption that executives know their strengths and weaknesses, feel strongly about role ambiguity (Cribbin, 1972, p. 217; Levinson, 1970), maintain control of conflict situations (Flory, 1971; Batten, 1963); and when forced to choose between competing alternatives in a conflict situation, often involuntarlly use direct authority to resolve the conflict (Mintzberg, 1975; Dailey, 1971).

Question 51 - Select the one situation which causes you the most conflict.
a. Your family accuses you of being married to your job, and demands more time with you.
b. You have been directed to reorganize your activity to a mode you objected to in the past.
c. Your company expects you to violate your personal ethics.
d. Your subordinate directly countermands your directions, however, his actions have lead to increased productivity.
e. You have a difference of opinion with your board of directors on the goals and objectives of the organization you head.

Question 52 - Your advisory board of ten members disagrees with you on an issue in which you strongly believe. What is the highest level of opposition you would tolerate before yielding to board advice? FOR AGAINST

| a. | 0 | - | 10 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| b. | 2 | - | 8 |
| c. | 3 | - | 7 |
| d. | 4 | - | 6 |
| e. | 5 | - | 5 |

Question 58 - It has been brought to your attention that two of your key people had a fight. The conflict continues to adversely affect the performance of their departments. What would you do?
a. Attempt to resolve the issue with each individual separately.
b. Do not get involved; let them resolve the issue themselves.
c. Call a conference to identify issues and resolve differences.
d. Direct them to drop the issue and get on with business.
e. Listen to the case, make judgment, and take appropriate action.
3. Desire for Power

Questions 60 and 62-67 in the instrument were designed to display an individual's desire for power. The respondents were requested to select the answer that best describes what they would do. These questions were developed to evaluate the respondents use of power in the decision-making process. They were based on unpublished materials presented by Professor C. B. Derr of NPS as part of a course in Organizational Behavior. The literature indicates that the desire for power becomes increasingly important with increasing success; but is used less consciously at the top of the organizational hierarchy (England and Weber, 1972, p. 16; Leavitt, 1958, p. 153).

Question 61 is used solely as a device to prevent the respondee from detecting a pattern in answering which might bias the results. Thus, it is a null or unmeasured question. Question 60 - a. I feel that accepted plans should generally represent the ideas of my subordinates.

OR
b. I expect subordinates to carry out plans I have prepared.

```
Question 61 - a. I am not so concerned with establishing close
                                    personal relationships as in getting sub-
                                    ordinates to follow my example.
    OR
b. I develop a close personal relationship with subordinates because I believe this marks out a good manager.
Question 62 - a. I believe that firm discipline is important to keep the work moving.
OR
b. I think that disciplining employees does more harm than good.
Question 63 - a. I am constantly concerned with high standards of performance and encourage subordinates to reach these standards.
OR
b. When a subordinate fails to perform I let him know of the failure in a firm and reasoned manner.
```

Question 64 - a. I think that subordinates should be able to overcome difficulties in the way to achievement themselves.

OR
b. When alternatives are described to me I am not long in indicating the course of action I prefer.

Question 65 - a. When I make a decision, I take the additional step of persuading my subordinates to accept it.

OR
b. I believe that subordinates should not be too discouraged by setbacks in the job, but rather should be able to clear blockages themselves.

Question 66 - a. In the long run, I will fire a man $I$ consider to be unmanageable.

OR
b. I discourage arguments which upset the harmony amongst subordinates.

Question 67 - a. I reward good work and feel that punishment for non-performance has limited use.

OR
b. When I discipline a subordinate I am definite in letting him know what he has done wrong.
4. Intuition

Question 56 in the instrument was designed to point out an individual's capacity for making decisions intuitively. It is based on the hypothesis that executives often make decisions intuitively (Jones, 1962, p. 51; Mintzberg, 1975, p. 53).

Question 56 - How frequently do you feel you have been right when faced with making decisions which are not backed with factual material?
a. Less than $50 \%$ of the time.
b. $50-60 \%$ of the time.
c. $60-70 \%$ of the time.
d. $70-80 \%$ of the time.
e. Greater than $80 \%$ of the time.
5. Courage to Commit Resources

Questions 53, 54 and 57 in the instrument were designed to show an individual's ability or courage in committing resources under varying degrees of risk or uncertainty. These questions are based on
the hypo-hesis that executives are willing to make decisions under risk or uncertainty and live with the results (Albers, 1969; Flory, 1971), are ready and willing to take risks to achieve organizationally-valued goals (England and Weber, 1972, p. 36), and welcome change and make many authorization decisions on an ad hoc basis (Mintzberg, 1975, p. 58; Daily, 1971).

Question 53 - Assume that for some reason a very close friend is forced to find another job. Some of the companies he has contacted are new and although their future success is uncertain, they offer potential salaries above that which he is now receiving. Indicate which company you would advise your friend to join.

## CHANCES FOR COMPANY SUCCESS

a. 2 in 10

PROSPECTIVE SALARY INCREASE
b. 4 in 10 200\%
c. 6 in 10 100\%
d. 8 in 10 50\%
e. Survival Guaranteed $25 \%$ $0 \%$

Question 54 - Your company has grown significantly in the past two years, and is now at capacity. You are considering expansion into a revolutionary new product line. The potential for a substantial return on investment is high if you enter now but will diminish rapidly if you delay. What would you do?
a. Do more research before making a decision.
b. Limit expansion to current product line.
c. Pursue it no further.
d. Invest in new product 1 ine.
e. Seek expansion through merger.

Question 57 - You manage a medium sized construction firm and recently learned of a new building material which is used extensively in Europe but has never been adopted in the United States. The building material appears to have several advantages in terms of substantial cost reduction, superior insulation qualities, and relative ease in construction as compared to its counterpart in the united States. After a thorough investigation, one of your engineers obtained extensive and reliable information on the characteristics, costs, and advantages of the new material. Further, your company could easily obtain
exclusive manufacturing rights for use in the United States. Indicate which of the following would best describe your approach to the building material.
a. Utilize the new idea in the firm's next major building project so as to take advantage of the substantial cost savings.
b. Use the building material in one of the firm's small, local building projects so as to test its acceptance.
c. Construct a non-commercial prototype.
d. Engage the services of an independent consultant.
e. Wait until the building material has received considerable commercial application in the United States.
B. INSTRUMENT PRE-TEST

Section III of the test instrument was admininstered to graduate students in the School's Master of Science in Management program to verify that the questions were appropriate, understandable, unambiguous, unbiased and provided meaningful information.

## C. EXPECTED VALUES FROM LITERATURE

Each question of Section III of the test instrument was evaluated by the authors to establish the response percentage expected for each answer. The expected responses, based upon the authors' interpreta$\therefore$ of the literature, are shown in APPENDIX F, Table F-5.

## VI. ADMINISTRATION OF TEST INSTRUMENT

## A. DEFINING POPULATIONS

1. Two of the three populations selected for obtaining primary data were the previous public and private executive populations selected by Leshko and Vosseteig. They selected respondents for the private executive population from the 500 largest corporations in the United States. They selected respondents for the public executive population from "Super Grade" civil servants (GS 16-18) in the Federal Government which were considered to be comparable to the private executive population in areas of control of assets and decision-making impact (Leshko and Vosseteig, 1975, p. 39).
2. The third population selected for obtaining primary data was the Naval Aviation Executive Institute (NAEI) mid-level managers (GS-13 to GS-15).

Major considerations for utilizing these sample populations were that the Leshko and Vosseteig primary data could be used for expanded research into executive responses. The NAEI population provided an opportunity for comparison of public middle-management responses with those of the executive populations.

## B. SAMPLING PROCEDURES

The authors used Leshko and Vosseteig's (1975) mailing list of selected executives to obtain the executive sample populations from the private and public sectors. Leshko and Vosseteig randomly selected
their sample populations using a "FORBES 500" list in conjunction with a "Standard and Poor's" list for the private executives, and a "Federal Government" list for the public executives. The authors' and Leshko and Vosseteig's executive sample population are identical except for the authors elimination of elements identified as deceased.

The middle-management sample (GS-13, 14 , and 15 ) was selected from the NAEI civilian population using a stratified random sampling technique.

The total sample population consisted of 680 elements with the following composition:

1. 294 executives from FORBES 500
2. 86 executives from the federal government
3. 300 NAEI middle-managers:

100 GS-15
100 GS-14
100 GS-13
C. SURVEY METHOD

Cover letters of introduction and questionnaires were mailed to each element of the sample populations to obtain primary data. (See APPENDIX C).

## VII. DATA ANALYSIS

## A. RESPONSES

Valid responses were received from 212 individuals prior to the previously established cut-off date of July 18, 1976. The composition of valid responses was as follows:

| Sample Category | Responses | Percent of Sample |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| FORBES 500 Executives | 57 | 19 |
| Government Executives | 32 | 37 |
| NAEI Managers | 123 | 41 |

Thirty-three additional questionnaires were returned unanswered, of which 28 were undeliverable while five indicated the addressee had either died or retired.
B. AUTOMATIC DATA PROCESSING PREPARATION AND UTILIZATION

The response data was transferred to 80 -column ADP cards in order to allow computer processing of the data received. Two data cards were generated for each completed instrument. The format of these data cards, and the instructions for keypunching are contained in APPENDIX D.

The data were processed using the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) software on the University of California, Berkeley CDC 7600 computer.
C. ANALYSIS RESULTS

Primary objectives of the analysis were to test the following hypotheses:

Hypothesis 4: Top management decision alternatives cannot be predicted by existing literature.

Hypothesis 5: Middle and Lower Management decision alternatives can be predicted by existing literature.

Hypothesis 6: Senior executives in private and public sectors respond similarly to situational stimuli.

The basic analysis approach was to segregate the population responses into meaningful sub-populations, and conduct statistical hypothesis testing within each sub-population and the entire population. Hypothesis testing was to be accomplished on each question within the test instrument as well as on aggregate question data corresponding to each capacity indicator to be measured.

Hypothesis testing was accomplished through the use of the non-parametric "Chi-Square" ( $\chi^{2}$ ) test and the parametic 't' test where appropriate. The test criteria were to provide $95 \%$ confidence in the results.

The population of responses were segregated into three subpopulations as follows:

| Population A = EXEC $=$ | Senior executives of private |
| ---: | :--- |
|  | industry |
| Population B = SUPER | Senior (GS-18, 17, 16) civil |
|  | service executives |
| Population C = GS-15, 14, 13 $=$ | NAEI civil service mid-level |
|  | managers |

Hypothesis 4, "Basis for Top Management decision alternatives cannot be predicted by existing literature," and 5, "Middle and Lower Management decision alternatives can be predicted by existing literature," were tested by comparing the responses of each subpopulation and the entire sample population, with the expected responses based upon the literature. APPENDIX F displays the expected responses and the results of this comparison for each of the appropriate questions. The questions, responses, and tests were grouped by capacity indicator to provide more meaningful results. These data are displayed in Table 3.

When the responses for the entire sample are compared with the Literature Expected (LE) responses, none of the original indicators show a significantly similar answer to that expected from the literature. However, when the population is segregated, some similarity is shown in two indicators, health and family relationships.

| CAPACITY <br> INDICATORS | $\mathrm{x}^{2}$ | DF | $\begin{aligned} & \text { ALL } \\ & X^{2} \cdot{ }_{95} \end{aligned}$ | DIFF | $\mathrm{x}^{2}$ | DF | $\begin{gathered} \text { EXEC } \\ x^{2} \cdot{ }_{95} \end{gathered}$ | DIFF | $x^{2}$ | DF | $\begin{aligned} & \text { SUPER } \\ & x^{2}{ }_{95} \end{aligned}$ | DIFF | $x^{2}$ | DF | $\begin{gathered} 15 / 14 / 1 \\ x^{2}{ }_{95} \end{gathered}$ | DIFP |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| (ORIGINAL INDICATORS) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Decision-Making Capability | 699.86 | 18 | 28.90 | Yes | 327.18 | 17 | 27.60 | Yes | 118.87 | 13 | 22.40 | Yes | 271.27 | 18 | 28.90 | Yes |
| Innovativeness | 733.61 | 19 | 30.10 | Yes | 233.14 | 15 | 25.00 | Yes | 137.76 | 13 | 22.40 | Yes | 387.23 | 15 | 25.00 | Yes |
| Ability to Manage Time | 701.33 | 10 | 18.30 | Yes | 113.36 | 8 | 15.50 | Yes | 71.91 | 5 | 11.10 | Yes | 258.01 | 8 | 15.50 | Yes |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Communicative } \\ & \text { Ability } \end{aligned}$ | 556.63 | 17 | Communicative |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Mobility | 113.83 | 4 | 9.49 | Yes | 14.49 | 4 | 9.49 | Yes | 40.86 | 3 | 7.81 | Yes | 79.77 | 4 | 9.49 | Yes |
| Psyche, Ego, Status | 126.36 | 8 | 15.50 | Yes | 86.56 | 5 | 11.10 | Yes | 16.55 | 4 | 9.49 | Yes | 39.76 | 6 | 12.60 | Yes |
| Health | 30.00 | 4 | 9.49 | Yes | 10.55 | 4 | 9.49 | Yes | 6.94 | 3 | 7.81 | No | 2.83 | 3 | 7.81 | No |
| Job Security | 93.05 | 4 | 9.49 | Yes | 28.59 | 4 | 9.49 | Yes | 20.55 | 3 | 7.81 | Yes | 54.01 | 3 | 7.81 | Yes |
| Rewarding Family and Social Life | 11.52 | 4 | 9.49 | Yes | 8.22 | 4 | 9.49 | No | 4.92 | 3 | 7.81 | No | 8.14 | 4 | 9.49 | No |
| MISC/Biographical |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| (NEW INDICATORS) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Stress | 487.69 | 11 | 19.70 | Yes | 118.52 | 8 | 15.50 | Yes | 71.75 | 7 | 14.10 | Yes | 302.32 | 9 | 16.90 | Yes |
| Reaction to Conflict | 438.34 | 10 | 18.30 | Yes | 125.05 | 7 | 14.10 | Yes | 30.90 | 6 | 12.60 | Yes | 256.01 | 9 | 16.90 | Yes |
| Courage to Cominit Resources | 221.78 | 10 | 18.30 | Yes | 69.66 | 8 | 15.50 | Yes | 12.12 | 4 | 9.49 | Yes | 113.96 | 8 | 15.50 | Yes |
| Intuition | 43.78 | 4 | 9.49 | Yes | 18.62 | 2 | 5.99 | Yes | . 09 | 2 | 5.99 | No | 32.75 | 3 | 7.81 | Yes |
| Desire for Power | 255.21 | 2 | 5.99 | Yes | 22.26 | 1 | 3.84 | Yes | 23.12 | 1 | 3.84 | Yes | 244.92 | 7 | 14.10 | Yes |

[^0]For the newly developed indicators, the entire sample population has no indicators which show similar responses to those expected by the literature. When the sub-populations are compared with the literature estimates, only one indicator shows a similarity, that being intuition and only within the population "Super."

To test hypothesis 6, "Senior executives in private and public sectors respond similary to situational stimuli," the responses to each question were compared statistically between each of the subpopulations. The results of this test can be seen in APPENDIX F. To make the comparison more meaningful, the questions were grouped into classes representing the capacity indicators they were intended to measure. The results of the comparison are shown in Table 4.

Of the original indicators, the EXEC population differs significantly from both the Super and GS-15-14-13 population in all but health, job security, and family; and with respect to GS-15-14-13 alone, are similar in only health. It is interesting to note that this compares favorably with the previous results of Leshko and Vosseteig. Of significant note, however, is the fact that the Super and GS-15-14-13 populations differ only in communication, mobility, and psyche/status. The latter two indicator results might be explained by differences in age and location in organization.

Of the newly added capacity indicators, only one shows a significant difference between the population sub-groups; that being conflict for the EXEC-SUPER comparison.
COMPARISON OF CAPACITY INDICATOR RESPONSE BY POPULATION ${ }^{1}$

| CAPACITY | EXEC/SUPER |  |  |  | EXEC/GS 15,14,13 |  |  |  | GS 15,14,13 |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| INDICATOR | $x^{2}$ | DF | $\mathrm{X}^{2} \cdot 95$ | DIFF | $x^{2}$ | DF | X.95 | DIFF | $\chi^{2}$ | DF | X.95 | DIFF |
| (ORIGINAL INDICATORS) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Decision-Making |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Capability | 42.93 | 20 | 31.40 | Yes | 67.85 | 20 | 31.40 | Yes | 25.48 | 20 | 31.40 | No |
| Innovativeness | 35.77 | 20 | 31.40 | Yes | 65.99 | 20 | 31.40 | Yes | 19.01 | 19 | 30.10 | No |
| Ability to Manage Time | 25.31 | 11 | 19.70 | Yes | 38.48 | 11 | 19.70 | Yes | 5.64 | 11 | 19.70 | No |
| Communicative |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Ability | 42.26 | 19 | 30.10 | Yes | 133.72 | 19 | 30.10 | Yes | 33.91 | 19 | 30.10 | Yes |
| Mobility | 157.81 | 108 | 132.90 | Yes | 232.95 | 116 | 141.80 | Yes | 151.22 | 96 | 119.60 | Yes |
| Psyche, Ego, Status | 199.78 | 26 | 38.90 | Yes | 275.22 | 25 | 37.70 | Yes | 50.19 | 18 | 28.90 | Yes |
| Health | 1.93 | 4 | 9.49 | No | 2.66 | 4 | 9.49 | No | 1.98 | 3 | 7.81 | No |
| Job Security | 9.13 | 4 | 9.49 | No | 20.51 | 4 | 9.49 | Yes | 3.19 | 3 | 7.81 | No |
| Rewarding Family and Social Life | 13.72 | 9 | 16.90 | No | 20.75 | 9 | 16.90 | Yes | 16.99 | 10 | 18.30 | No |
| Misc/Biographical (NEW INDICATORS) | 263.98 | 156 | 185.90 | Yes | 358.20 | 174 | 205.50 | Yes | 276.60 | 157 | 187.00 | Yes |
| Ability Under Stress | 12.27 | 7 | 14.10 | No | 16.55 | 11 | 19.70 | No | 8.71 | 9 | 16.90 | No |
| Reaction to Conflict | 22.18 | 10 | 18.30 | Yes | 16.38 | 12 | 21.00 | No | 15.87 | 12 | 21.00 | No |
| Courage to Commit Resources | 8.30 | 11 | 19.70 | No | 19.39 | 12 | 21.00 | No | 15.37 | 11 | 19.70 | No |
| Intuition | 8.59 | 4 | 9.49 | No | 4.16 | 4 | 9.49 | No | 7.32 | 4 | 9.49 | No |
| Desire for Power | 4.11 | 2 | 5.99 | No | 4.60 |  | 5.99 | No | . 06 | 2 | 5.99 | No | ${ }^{1}$ This table displays the results of comparison of responses of one population with that of another to determine if responses differ. The test used was Chi-Square with a significance level of $95 \%$. The table shows the raw Chi-Square value ( $\mathrm{X}^{2}$ ), the degrees of freedom (DF), the critical value at $95 \%$ confidence ( $\chi^{2} \cdot 95$ ) and whether or not the responses were different (DIFF).

a. Executives in both the private and government sectors tend not to respond to stimuli in the manner predicted by the literature. Therefore, hypothesis 4, "Basis for Top Management decision alternatives cannot be predicted by existing literature," is accepted; whereas hypothesis 5, 'Middle and Lower Management decision alternatives can be predicted by existing literature," is rejected.
b. Executives in the private and public sector respond differently to some questions designed to evaluate capacity indicators, thus hypothesis 6, "Senior executives in private and public sectors respond similarly to situational stimuli," is rejected for those indicators in which they differ.
c. Executives in the government, at the top and mid-level, tend to respond similarly to questions designed to evaluate capacity indicators.
d. The questionnaire does, in fact, provide some degree of differentiation between populations as described by $a, b$, and $c$ above.
e. Because the literature cannot be used to score the questionnaire for use as a selection document (a above), another scoring system must be developed. It is reasonable to use the actual responses of the executives as that scoring base. This would tend to support hypothesis 7, "Response patterns of executives can be used as a baseline in evaluating potential executives."

## VIII. CONCLUSIONS

The analysis of responses gathered by this study show that:

1. Questions can be developed using situational stimuli to identify capacity indicators:
a. Reaction to conflict.
b. Ability under stress.
c. Desire for power.
d. Courage to commit resources
e. Intuition.
2. Executives in private industry respond differently than do executives in civil service for some capacity indicators and not others. Therefore, hypothesis 6 is rejected.
3. Civil service executives (SUPER) and middle managers (GS 15-14-13) respond to situational stimuli in a similar manner.
4. Management literature cannot be relied upon to predict how public and private executives, as well as mid-level managers, will respond; therefore, hypothesis 4 is accepted and hypothesis 5 is rejected.
5. The use of the responses of the executives as a basis for a scoring system for the questionnaire appears to be valid, thus supporting hypothesis 7. However, final acceptance or rejection of this hypothesis must be delayed until further study is accomplished using this scoring system.

## IX. RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FURTHER STUDY

The results of this study indicate that situational stimuli in the form of a questionnaire can be utilized to identify potential executives. While the data were very encouraging, the study is also incomplete. The authors recommend the following be considered for further research:

1. Finalize the development of the questionnaire scoring system utilizing the executive responses as a base and further test the questionnaire and scoring system on other populations.
2. Use the new data to revise the instrument and re-test.
3. Compare the results from the revised instrument with those from other identification procedures; i.e., assessment centers, interview, etc.

$$
\begin{gathered}
\text { APPENDIX A } \\
\text { Definition of Key Terms }
\end{gathered}
$$

The appendix contains twelve key terms of which six: success, trait, indicator, capacity, management and situational response were previously defined by Leshko and Vosseteig (1975); and are still applicable in this study. Six key terms unique to this study consist of: conflict, power, stress, intuition and courage to commit resources.

|  | APPENDIX A Definition of Key Terms |
| :---: | :---: |
| Success | - highest position attainable within hierarchy |
|  | of organization, or salary renumeration well |
|  | above the average. A favorable or satisfactory |
|  | outcome or result. The gaining of wealth, fame, |
|  | rank, etc. (Webster, 1960). The measure of |
|  | success is definitely open to question, but |
|  | salary level appears to be the most signifi- |
|  | cantly considered factor, seconded by expendi- |
|  | ture authorization and to a much lower weight |
|  | level of supervision (Leshko and Vosseteig, |
|  | 1975, p. 56). |
| Trait | - a distinguishing quality or characteristic, |
|  | especially of personality (Webster, 1960). |
| Indicator | - to be or give a sign or token of; signify; |
|  | betoken, intimate (Webster, 1960). |
| Capacity | - the ability to contain, absorb, or receive and |
|  |  |
| Management | - term used to mean both an area of knowledge and |
|  | people making up the profession (Uris, 1962). |
| Situational | - a specific set of social or interpersonal |
| Stimuli | circumstances used, in a situational test, |
|  | causing an individual to react, providing a |
|  | situational response. |


|  |  | situation that requires an adaptive response," (English \& English, 1958, p. 504). |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Situational | - | "action a person would take when events take |
| Response |  | place requiring him to make decision," (Leshko and Vosseteig, 1975, p. 19) |
| Executives | - | individuals in upper management in the public and private sectors. |
| Conflict | - | the necessity to make a choice from competing |
|  |  | alternatives. An emotional state charac- |
|  |  | terized by indecision, restlessness, uncertainty |
|  |  | and tension (Webster, 1971). |
| Power | - | "the total amount of influence that an |
|  |  | individual has in an organization; that is, |
|  |  | his total ability to influence the behavior |
|  |  | of people," (Kazmier, 1969, p. 166). |
| Stress | - | emotional factor characterized by strain, |
|  |  | pressure, tension, thrust (Webster, 1971). |
| Intuition | - | immediate cognizance or conviction without |
|  |  | rational thought (Webster, 1971). |
| Courage to | - | ability to make decision under high degree |
| Commit Resources |  | of risk or uncertainty. |


#### Abstract

APPENDIX B Question Development by Leshko and Vosseteig This appendix contains the questions (1-49) and the basis for their development by Leshko and Vosseteig (1975). These questions were incorporated into Sections I and II of their Executive Perceptions Questionnaire; which, in turn, was used verbatim by the authors in the expanded questionnaire.


## APPENDIX B

## Question Development by Leshko and Vosseteig

1. Questions and Hypothesis of Test Instrument

This section shows the questions included in the instrument. The hypothesis upon which the questions were founded are stated. Literature supporting the hypothesis is referenced. The questions relating to the separate identifier classes were intermingled throughout the testing instrument. However, they are grouped into identifier classes here because of commonality of purpose and for ease of referencing.
a. Decision-Making Capabilty

Questions $26,41,42,43$ and 44 in the instrument are intended to show the capacity for making effective decisions. Question 26 - "Which one of the following best describes what you you usually do in making important decisions?"
a. Make the decision and inform your boss later on.
b. Make the decision as if it were a routine matter.
c. Put the problem up to those affected by the decision.
d. Decision making is not my responsibility. e. Take time to check with your boss.

This question is based upon the hypothesis that successful executives are more concerned with solving the problem at hand than about the decision making process (McFarland, 1974, p. 270-271).

Question 41 - "You are about-to propose a new policy which you feel is good for the organization. You intuitively believe, however, that you will have difficulty convincing certain segments of the organization. You are further aware that unless you receive almost across-the-board concurrence, top management will not institute the policy. How would you go about "seeing to it" that your policy is accepted?"
a. Work around the opposition, by going directly to top management and attempt to convince them with the profitability of your proposed policy.
b. Determine who your supporters are and seek their assistance to favorably impress the opposition.
c. Specifically, identify those individuals who are opposed and attempt to convince them individually.
d. Ignore the opposition and continue with your new policy changes.
e. Postpone introduction of the policy change and wait for better timing.

The hypothesis is that a successful executive is a strategist and uses his knowledge of people for mutual benefit of all concerned (McFarland, 1974, p. 450-455).

Question 42 - "As a decision maker:"
a. You accept success and failure equally.
b. When you have failed, you have accepted the consequences and continued on as before.
c. When you fail you accept the consequences and will analyze the causative factors thereto. Such a set back will not deter your future efforts.
d. Your aim is to always succeed no matter what procedures or methods must be employed to accomplish your objectives.
e. You are successful because you thoroughly investigate the parameters surrounding the decision about to be made.

This question is founded upon the hypothesis that executives have deep feelings of satisfaction directly related to accomplishment and achievement (McFarland, 1974, p. 39; Warner, 1962, p. 47-57). Question 43 - "Assume you are considering several proven company executives for a promotion. However, you consider the best among them to be a "maverick" with respect to his management/leadership style. If you decide on selecting the "maverick" would you?"
a. Insist that his management/leadership style conform to present organization policies.
b. Modify the organization to adjust to his management/ leadership style.
c. Prefer to allow him to operate as he pleases so long as his performance results in a highly satisfactory performance.
d. Prefer to allow him to operate within his style, but at the appropriate time tactully remind him that the company policies are sound and will prove beneficial to him in the long run.
e. You would not select the "maverick."

The hypothesis is that executives have a unique ability to pick people for situational needs (Fielder, 1965, p. 115-122). Question 44 - "If you have just been promoted two levels above your present position (same company), you would function at this new level?"
a. By proceeding cautiously before making decisions.
b. By waiting to gain confidence and with additional experience make decisions faster than when initially assigned.
c. With no delay in decision making because earlier training and experience adequately prepared you for this increased responsibility.
d. Because in the past when assigned to a new or unfamiliar area, you had no difficulty in commanding the new job and therefore, would anticipate no delay in decision making now.
e. By operating at this higher level may require you to grow into the job simply because of the scope of the position.

The question is founded upon the hypothesis that executives will quickly adapt to new environmental responsibilities and only minor delays in decisions will occur (Uris, 1962, p. 50-59, 63-67).
b. Innovativeness

Questions 27, 28, 29, 30 and 31 of the instrument are designed to display the abiliity to institute change in an organization, and cause the organization to adopt new technology.

Question 27 - "Indicate which combination of words, when placed in the following sentence, would most accurately describe you: you hear about new work-related developments most of my colleagues."
a. Considerably before.
b. Sooner than.
c. At about the same time as.
d. Later than.
e. Sometime later.

This question is based upon the hypothesis that effective executives become aware of work related developments before less competent ones (Creighton, Jolly, Denning, 1972, p. 16).

Question 28 - "Indicate the frequency with which your subordinates, peers, and/or superiors came to you in the past month for work-related information which was not a function of your position?"
a. 1-3
b. 4-7
c. 8-11
d. 12-16
e. 17 or more

This question is based upon the hypothesis that successful opinion leaders [sic] and that others have confidence in their judgment (Creighton, Jolly, Denning, 1972, p. 19-21).

Question 29 - "In the past year, how many non-routine, work-related projects have been completed for which you supplied the original idea?"
a. 0
b. 1-2
c. 3-4
d. 5-6
e. 7 or more

This question is based upon the hypothesis that successful executives are innovators, are dynamic, and modify organizations to accommodate change (Creighton, Jolly, Denning, 1972, p. 33).

Question 30 - "Which of the following do you tend to rely upon most heavily is a source of initial information for workrelated projects and/or problems?"
a. Litera-ure - books, manuals, dissertations, and other items which are not published on a regular basis.
b. Vendors - representatives of, or documentation generated by suppliers or potential suppliers.
c. Personal Experience - ideas which were previously used by yourself in similar situations and recalled directly by memory.
d. Staff - selected members of your staff who are not assigned directly to the project being considered.
e. External Sources - sources which do not fall into any one of the catagories.

This question is based upon the hypothesis that the higher the executive is within the executive circles the more he tends to rely on external sources (Fulmer, 1974, p. 361-380).

Question 31 - "When you hear about a new idea which may be of use to your organezation you?"
a. Analyze it in depth before instituting it.
b. See how it works in other organizations.
c. Turn it over to a person in your organization who is most likely to use it.
d. Discuss it and its applicability at your next conference.
e. Turn it over to a cost analyst to determine its value.

This question is based upon the hypothesis that the executive causes changes to happen in his organization (Koontz and O'Donnell, 1955, p. 524-530).
c. Ability to Manage Time

Questions 38, 39 and 40 in the instrument are intended to show the capacity of executives to use their time effectively. Question 38 - "How do you beel about the time you have to do your work?"
a. Have time for everything without feeling pushed. b. Wish you had a little more time to plan and to think.
c. Necessary to keep pushing to get everything done.
d. Very hard to do what is expected of you in the time available.
e. Never seem to have enough time to do everything.

This question is based upon the hypothesis that successful executives utilize time efficiently and are able to make time available (Whyte, 1956, p. 155-165; Gardner, 1963, p. 52). Question 39 - "With respect to the amount of time you spend at work." a. You do not view your position as having fixed working hours.
b. You consider yourself as a professional that [sic] will give whatever amount of time is required, at the time, to accomplish the present undertaking.
c. As a general rule, you accomplish at least or more work outside the office than while working at the office.
d. You simply feel that working hours are for "others" and you give whatever time is required to accomplish a task and work at it until it is completed.
e. You try not to allow your outside personal interests to cause you to mismanage your time.

This question is founded upon the hypothesis that successful executives have high energy levels, do not consider themselves as having regular working hours, and use their time to great advantage (Jennings, 1967, p. 88-89; McCay, 1959, p. 31-37). Question 40 - "Of the situations given, which of these best describes your wark routine?"
a. You have time in your daily routine to spend time on the unexpected.
b. As a general rule, your daily schedule is very heavy.
c. If it were not for your subordinates taking up a good part of your time, you would have more than enough time to expand your involvement in the company's business.
d. You have no difficulty with the management of your time since you set a fixed and precise dally schedule, allowing time for your seniors, subordinates, and whatever is left belongs to you.
e. You are concerned with the amount of time you have to spend at the office, because you feel your superiors interpret this as an indicator of ineffectiveness.

This question is founded upon the hypothesis that successful executives make effective use of time (Oncken, 1974, p. 75-80).
d. Communicative Ability

Questions 23, 24, 25, 32 and 33 in the instrument are
intended to show the effective use of communication.
Question 23 - "Indicate the number of work-related organizations to which you hold current membership."
a. 0
b. 1-2
c. 3-4
d. 5-6
e. More than the above

This question in based upon the hypothesis that successful executives are better informed and expand their levels of interests beyond local environment (Creighton, Jolly, Denning, 1972, p. 34).

Question 24 - "How many new friends have you made in the past year?"
a. No need to make new friends.
b. 1-2
c. 3-5
d. 6 or more
e. Cannot remember exactly.

This question is founded upon the hypothesis that successful executives are extroverts and gregarious individuals (Creighton, Jolly, Denning, 1972, p. 16, 33-34).

Question 25 - "On the average, how many people do you see daily, (excluding your immediate stafb)?"
a. 0-4
b. 5-8
c. 9-12
d. 12-16
e. 16 or more

This question is based upon the hypothesis that executives interact with more people and are exposed to more new ideas than non-successful people (Fulmer, 1974, p. 307, 320-338).

Question 32 - "When information concerning major decision are to be made, you?"
a. Recognize, among other things, that upward communcations have little or no value to the management of the organization.
b. Acknowledge that an important decision about decisions is when to communicate them, if at all.
c. Insist that a decision is communicated in a language that will not antagonize its receptiveness.
d. Recognize that some restrictions may improve organizational effectiveness.
e. Insist that every decision be communicated in a language that leaves no doubt to the intent or spirit of the decision.

This question is founded upon the hypothesis that a successful executive is an effective communicator, because he realizes the importance of the timing of and strategy of communicating a decision (Koontz, 1972, p. 536-555; Fulmer, 1974, p. 296-316).

Question 33 - "Indicate the total number of journals, magazines, and newspapers which you regularly read."
a. 1-2
b. 3-4
c. $5-6$
d. $7-8$
e. 9 or more

This question is founded upon the hypothesis that executives are well read, and professionally current [sic] through consumption of mass media (Creighton, Jolly, Denning, 1972, p. 22-24).
e. Psyche/Status

Questions $34,35,36,37$ and 46 of the instrument are designed to display the reward needs of the individuals.

Question 34 - "What is your present salary range?"
a. $\$ 10,000-\$ 20,000$ f. $\$ 100,000-\$ 150,000$
b. $\$ 20,000-\$ 30,000$ g. $\$ 150,000-\$ 200,000$
c. $\$ 30,000-\$ 50,000$ h. $\$ 200,000-\$ 300,000$
d. $\$ 50,000-\$ 75,000$ i. $\$ 300,000$ or greater
e. $\$ 75,000-\$ 100,000$

This question was asked to determine the approximate financial compensation that each respondent received.

Question 35 - "Would you work at your present job for a lesser
salary?"
a. Yes
b. No

This question is based upon the hypothesis that successful executives have high reward needs, other than money (Whyte, 1956, p. 159-160).

Question 36 - "If Yes, by how much?"
a. $0-\$ 1,000$
b. $\$ 1,000-\$ 2,000$
c. $\$ 2,000-\$ 5,000$
d. $\$ 5,000-\$ 10,000$
e. $\$ 10,000-\$ 15,000$
f. $\$ 15,000-\$ 20,000$
g. $\$ 20,000-\$ 30,000$
h. $\$ 30,000-\$ 40,000$
i. $\$ 40,000-\$ 50,000$
j. $\$ 50,000-\$ 100,000$

This question was asked to determine approximately the amount that the respondent would relinquish.

Question 37 - "If No, why not?"
a. Money is very important to you.
b. You are worth what you are being paid.
c. For your unique skills, you will not work for less than your present salary.
d. Money is not a direct concern to you, but it is important to your family.
e. Present earning power is necessary to provide a portfolio for future security.

This question was asked to determine from five responses given in the instrument what the respondents reasons were for not working at their present position for a lesser salary.

Question 46 - "In a position that you feel is not exactly what you want:"
a. You do whatever is required and receive what you believe to be only minimal personal or professional satisfaction from the results of your efforts.
b. You consider the results of your efforts to be negligible and in fact believe your efforts to be "dog work."
c. You consider your efforts to be professionally and personally rewarding even though you are not completely happy with your present position.
d. You have in retrospect, almost always derived personal satisfaction from your job regardless of your personal feelings toward the assignments. e. You do what is required, knowing or hoping that the present assignment (occupation) is only a means to an end.

This question is based upon the hypotheses that successful executives tend to feel satisfied doing things that have to be done (McFarland, 1974, p. 96, 110).
f. Mobility

Questions $9,16,17,19,20,21$ and 47 of the instrument are intended to show managerial development.

Question 9 - "Length of time with present organization? (Years)"
Question 16 - "How many different organizations have you been employed by in your life time?"

Question 17 - "What is the longest that you have worked for the same organization? (Years)"

Questions 16 and 17 are based upon the hypothesis that successful executives move around as they move upward (Jennings, 1967, p. 8)

Question 19 - "Have you changed your religious preference?
(1) Yes (2) No"

Question 20 - "If Yes, how many times?"

Questions 19 and 20 are based upon the hypothesis that successful executives change their religious denomination as they ascend the corporate ladder (Whyte, 1956, p. 405-422; Newcomer, 1955, p. 46-49; Packard, 1959, p. 194-206).

Question 21 - "What is/was your fathers occupation? If deceased or retired please indicate last occupation $\qquad$
$\qquad$ ."

This question is based upon the hypothesis that successful executives who are children of proven executives have a higher incidence of becoming successful executives themselves (Jennings, 1967, p. 6-9).

Question 47 - "You accepted employment with your present company:"
a. Thinking or knowing that it would be only a temporary assignment, carrying with it a promise or possibility that a better position would be available in a reasonable time.
b. Realizing that it was exactly what you wanted to do and had no desire for higher levels of aspiration.
c. Because of your specific or unique skills that were desired by the employer, who was willing to pay you commensurate with your proven abilities.
d. Because of your unique skills that were desired by the employer but you also set your remuneration schedule.
e. Because there were no other positions available or opportunities that suited you.

This question is founded upon the hypothesis that successful executives are sought after and set their own salary schedule (Koontz, 1972, p. 417-436; Uris, 1962, p. 96).
g. Rewarding Family Life

Questions 12,13 , and 45 in the instrument are intended to show the capacity for effective family relations.

Question 12 - "Select the most appropriate situation that describes your Marital Status? (1) Divorced
(2) Divorced and remarried (3) Married (4) Single
(5) Widow/Widower."

Question 13 - "How many times have you been married?"
Questions 12 and 13 are based upon the hypothesis that
successful executives have high divorce rates (Packard, 1962, p. 58-66; Packard, 1959, p. 120, 122, 159-160, 170-172 and 279;

Newcomer, 1955, p. 122-123).

Question 45 - "As you reflect on your career, judge the present, and postulate about the future regarding the relationship with your family, family responsibilities and demands of your present position; how would you best describe the way in which the relationship exists or developed?"
a. Family responsibilities were/are not neglected since a mutual bond of understanding developed as you proceeded through your career, wherein the family was/is supportive of your professional goals.
b. Your family has/did not place you in a position wherein you had to choose between family or professional goals.
c. Family obligations occasionally have taken a secondary position if your professional goals and requirements of your job were to be attained. However, you attempted to make it up to the family whenever the occasion(s) allowed.
d. You attempted to make a compromise decision between family and job, but rarely sacrificed the family.
e. Sometimes, demands of the job, i.e., time sensitive issues, demanded that you put more hours on the job than you would like.

This question is founded upon the hyposthesis that successful executives acknowledge family responsibility and work toward fulfilling it (Whyte, 1956, p. 162).

## h. Job Security

Question 48 of the instrument is to display the fear of losing one's position [sic].

Question 48 - "When you take a vacation:"
a. You find it is most beneficial to take one long vacation as opposed to several short vacation trips.
b. You fit your vacation schedule into what the organization will allow you to take.
c. You find it best to schedule your vacation with the needs and desires of your family.
d. You do not take long vacations (more than two weeks) because you recognize that you will have to work twice as hard to catch up on your work when you return.
e. You take vacations only for reasons of health.

This question is founded upon the hypothesis that successful executives fear that the more time they are away from the job, the more his [sic] job is jeopardized (Whyte, 1956, p. 77).
i. Health

Question 49 in the instrument is to display the executive's belief in his state of health [sic].

Question 49 - "How good is your health?"
a. Poor - need rest and/or medical treatment to attack the rigorous [sic] of daily business activity.
b. Based upon your judgment and substantiated by your physicians evaluation, you are in good health for your age.
c. Based upon your judgment and supported by your physicians evaluation, you are in better health than someone of your age [sic].
d. Fair - you recognize the need to keep yourself physically toned up, but your demanding schedule has precluded you from adhering to a set exercise schedule.
e. Perfect - can drive hard on any job, night or day.

This question is based upon the hypothesis that successful executives are concerned about their state of health, and attempt to say 'healthy' (Uris, 1955, p. 123).


#### Abstract

APPENDIX C

Executive Judgmental Perceptions Questionnaire This appendix consists of the three items used to initiate this study. The first is a cover letter used to introduce the questionnaire to 300 individuals in the Naval Aviation Executive Institute and acquaint them with the purpose and scope of the study. The second item is the cover letter used to request additional situational stimuli response information from previously sampled executive populations from the private and public sectors. The last item is an identical copy of the Executive Judgmental Perceptions Questionnaire that accompanied each cover letter of introduction.


# NAVAL POSTGRADUATE SCHOOL 

MONTEREY, CALIFORNIA - 93940

Mr. John Doe<br>3169 Salem Drive<br>Cupcake, MI 10014

Dear Mr. Doe,
The purpose of this letter is to request your assistance in a research program regarding successful executives. As a professor of the Naval Postgraduate School, Monterey, California, I am conducting research studies with proven executives in top management positions.

I have enclosed a short series of questions entitled "Executive Judgmental Perceptions". This information document asks for basic, yet specific situational decision choices. Your answers will provide invaluable data upon which a fundamental and a unique baseline will be established. I assure you that your personal identity and individual responses will not be released in any way. Only unidentified group information will be used in this study. The success or failure of this research effort will naturally depend upon your response.

The enclosed series of questions should take approximately fifteen minutes to answer. The document is divided into small sections with pertinent instructions prior to each division.

Thank you for your cooperation.

## Sincerelv

The purpose of this letter is to request your assistance in a continuing research program regarding successful executives in top management positions.

I have enclosed a short series of questions entitled 'Executives Judgmental Perceptions". Sections I and II were originally sent to you 7 February 1975 whereas Section III is a new addition. If you have previously filled out Sections I and II, it is requested that you answer Section III only.

Your answers to this survey will provide invaluable data upon which a fundamental and unique baseline will be established. I will assure you that your personal identity and individual responses will not be released in any way. Only unidentified group information will be used in this study. The success or failure of this research effort will naturally depend upon your response.

The enclosed series of questions should take approximately 20 minutes to answer. The document is divided into small sections with pertinent instructions prior to each division.

Thank you for your cooperation.

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{F}_{\Delta} X \text { E EUUTIVE } \\
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## SOLICITATION OF JUDGEMENTAL PERCEPTIONS

TRUCTIONS FOR COMPLETING THIS INFORMATION DOCUMENT ARE PROVIDED ORE EACH SECTION.

## SECTION ONE


#### Abstract

Please enter the most appropriate answer in the box at the right of each question. The number preceeding the solid vertical line correspondes to the question number in the appropriate box or boxes. If the question calls for a response of more than a one digit response please place "ONLY" one digit per box. Disregard the numbers to the right of the boxes.


Is your present employer. . .(1) Military (2) Civilian?
What position do you hold within your organization?
(Please write out your position) i.e. President, Finanical Manager, or Production Manager. If Military, please indicate rank.

Location of organization? (1) New England (2) Eastern U.S. (3) Southeast (4) North Central (5) South Central (6) Northwest (7) Southwest (8) Alaska (9) Hawaii (10) Overseas Age?

Sex? (1) Female (2) Male
Height? (INCHES)
Weight? (1bs)
Race? (1) American Indian (2) Black (3) Oriental
(4) Spanish-American (5) White

Lenght of time with present organization? (YEARS)
What is your LAST level of formal education? (1) High School Diploma (2) BA (3) BS (4) MBA (5) MPA (6) Masters (7) Doctorate

What was your major field of study? $\qquad$
Select the most appropriate situation that describes your Marital Status? (1) Divorced (2) Divorced and remarried (3) Married (4) Single (5) Widow/Widower

"13. How many times have you been married?
14. How many children do you have? Sons $\qquad$ (Indicate on spaces provided) Daughters $\qquad$ None $\qquad$
15. Spouse's highest level of formal education?
(1) No Spouse
(6) 15 years
(2) Less than 12 years
(7) 16 years
(3) 12 years
(8) 17 years
(4) 13 years
(9) 18 years
(5) 14 years
(10) Greater than 18 years
16. How many different organizations have you been employed by in your life time?
17. What is the longest that you have worked for the same organization? (YEARS)
18. What is your religious preference? (1) None (2) Catholic (3) Jewish (4) Other (5) Protestant (Please indicate denomination) $\qquad$
19. Have you changed your religious preference?
(1) Yes
(2) No
20. If yes, how many times?
21. What is/was your fathers occupation? If deceased or retired please indicate last occupation $\qquad$
22. Are you a United States Citizen?
(1) Yes (2) No

## SECTION TwO

Please answer the following questions in the present tense, i.e., how would you decide today, not how you decided in the past. Indicate your response in the box to the right of each question. The number preceeding the solid vertical line correspondes to the question number in the appropriate box. Disregard the numbers to the right of the boxes.
23. Indicate the number of work-related organizations to which you hold current membership.
A. 0
B. $1-2$
C. $3-4$
D. $5-6$
E. More than the above
24. How many new friends have you made in the past year?
A. No need to make new friends.
B. 1 - 2
C. 3-5
D. 6 or more.
E. Cannot remember exactly.
25. On the average, how many people do you see daily, (Excluding your immediate staff)
A. $0-4$
B. $5-8$
C. $9-12$
D. 12 - 16
E. 16 or more.
26. Which one of the following best describes what you usually do in making important decisions?
A. Make the decision and inform your boss later on.

B, Make the decision as if it were a routine matter.
C. Put the problem up to those affected by the decision.
D. Decision making is not my responsibility.
E. Take time to check with your boss.
27. Indicate which combination of words, when placed in the following sentence, would most accurately describe you: you hear about new work-related developments $\qquad$ most of my colleagues.
A. Considerably before
B. Sooner than
C. At about the same time as
D. Later than
E. Sometime after
28. Indicate the frequency with which your subordinates, peer, and/ or superiors came to you in the past month for work related information which was not a function of your position?
A. $1-3$
B. $4-7$
C. 8 - 11
D. $12-16$
E. 17 or more
29. In the past year, how many non-routine, work-related projects have been completed for which you supplied the original idea?
A. 0
B. $1-2$
C. $3-4$
D. $5-6$
E. 7 or more
30. Which of the following do you tend to rely upon most heavily as a source of initial information for work-related projects and/or problems?
A. Literature - books, manuals, dissertations, and other items which are not published on a regular basis.
B. Vendors - representatives of, or documantation generated by suppliers or potential suppliers.
C. Personal Experience - ideas which were previously used by yourself in similar situations and recalled directly by memory.
D. Staff - selected members of your staff who are not assigned directly to the project being considered.
E. External Sources - sources which do not fall into any one of the catagories.
31. When you hear about a new idea which may be of use to your organization you?
A. Analyze it in depth before instituting it.
B. See how it works in other organizations.
C. Turn it over to a person in your organization who is most likely to use it.
D. Discuss it and its applicability at your next conference.
E. Turn it over to a cost analyst to determine its value.
32. When information concerning major decisions are to be made, you?
A. Recognize, among other things, that upward communications have iittle or no value to the management of the organization.
B. Acknowledge that an important decision about decisions is when to communicate them, if at all.
C. Insist that a decision is communicated in a language that will not antagonize its receptiveness.
D. Recognize that some restrictions may improve organizational effectiveness.
E. Insist that every decision be communicated in a language that leaves no doubt to the intent or spirit of the decision.
33. Indicate the total number of journals, magazines, and newspapers which you regularly read.
A. $1-2$
B. $3-4$
C. $5-6$
D. 7 - 8
E. 9 or more
34. What is your present salary range?
A. $\$ 10,000-\$ 20,000$
B. $\$ 20,000-\$ 30,000$
C. $\$ 30,000-\$ 50,000$
F. $\$ 100,000-\$ 150,000$
D. $\$ 50,000-\$ 75,000$
G. $\$ 150,000-\$ 200,000$
E. $\$ 75,000-\$ 100,000$
H. \$200,000 - \$300,000
I. $\$ 300,000$ or greater
35. Would you work at your present job for a lesser salary?
A. Yes
B. No
36. If Yes, by how much?
A. $0-\$ 1,000$
F. $\$ 15,000-\$ 20,000$
B. $\$ 1,000-\$ 2,000$
G. $\$ 20,000-\$ 30,000$
C. $\$ 2,000-\$ 5,000$
H. $\$ 30,000-\$ 40,000$
D. \$5,000 - \$10,000
I. $\$ 40,000-\$ 50,000$
E. $\$ 10,000-\$ 15,000$
J. $\$ 50,000-\$ 100,000$
37. If No, why not?
A. Money is very important to you.
B. You are worth what you are being paid.
C. For your unique skills, you will not work for less than your present salary.
D. Money is not a direct concern to you, but it is important to your family.
E. Present earning power is necessary to provide a portfolio for future security.
38. How do you feel about the time you have to do your work?
A. Have time for everything without feeling pushed.
B. Wish you had a little more time to plan and to think.
C. Necessary to keep pushing to get everything done.
D. Very hard to do what is expected of you in the time available.
E. Never seem to have enough time to do everything.
39. With respect to the amount of time you spend at "work"
A. You do not view your position as having fixed working hours
B. You consider yourself as a professional that will give whatever amount of time is required, at the time, to accomplish the present undertaking.
C. As a general rule, you accomplish at least or more work outside the office than while working at the office.
D. You simply feel that working hours are for "others" and you give whatever time is required to accomplish a task and work at it until it is completed.
E. You try not to allow your outside personal interests to carıse you to mismanage your time.
40. Of the situations given, which of these best describes your work routine?
A. You have time in your daily routine to spend time on the unexpected.
B. As a general rule, your daily schedule is very heavy.
C. If it were not for your subordinates taking up a good part of your time, you would have more than enough time to expand your involvement in the company's business.
D. You have no difficulty with the management of your time since you set a fixed and precise daily schedule, allowing time for your seniors, subordinates, and whatever is left belongs to you.
E. You are concerned with the amount of time you have to spend at the office, because you feel your superiors interpret this as an indicator of ineffectiveness.
41. You are about to propose a new policy which you feel is good for the organization. You intuitively believe, however, that you will have difficulty convincing certain segments of the organization. You are further aware that unless you receive almost across the board concurrence, top management will not institute the policy. How would you go about "seeing to it" that your policy is accepted?
A. Work around the opposition, by going directly to top management and attempt to convince them with the profitability of your proposed policy.
B. Determine who your supporters are and seek their assistance to favorably impress the opposition.
C. Specifically, identify those individuals who are opposed and attempt to convince them individually.
D. Ignore the opposition and continue with your new policy changes.
E. Postpone introduction of the policy change and wait for better timing.
42. As a decision maker:
A. You accept success and failure equally.
B. When you have failed, you have accepted the consequences and continued on as before.
C. When you fail you accept the consequences and will analyze the causative factors thereto. Such a set back will not deter your future efforts.
D. Your aim is to always succeed no matter what procedures or methods must be employed to accomplish you objectives.
E. You are successful because you thoroughly investigate the parameters surrounding the decision about to be indle.
43. Assume you are considering several proven company executives for a promotion. However, you consider the best among them to be a "maverick" with respect to his management/leadership style. If you decide on selecting the "maverick" would you?
A. Insist that his management/leadership style conform to present organization policies.
B. Modify the organization to adjust to his management/leadership style.
C. Prefer to allow him to operate as he pleases so long as his performance results in a highly satisfactory performance.
D. Prefer to allow him to operate within his style, but at the appropriate time tactfully remind him that the company policies are sound and will prove beneficial to him in the long run.
E. You would not select the "maverick."
44. If you have just been promoted two levels above your present position (same company), you would function at this new level?
A. By proceeding cautiously before making decisions.
B. By waiting to gain confidence and with additional experience make decisions faster than when initially assigned.
C. With no delay in decision making because earlier training and experience adequately prepared you for this increased responsibility.
D. Because in the past when assigned to a new or unfamiliar area, you had no difficulty in commanding the new job and therefore, would anticipate no delay in decision making now.
E. By operating at this higher level may require you to grow into the job simply because of the scope of the position.
45. As you reflect on your career, judge the present, and postulate about the future regarding the relationship with your family, family responsibilities and demands of your present position, how would you best describe the way in which the relationship exists or developed?
A. Family responsibilities were/are not neglected since a mutual bond of understanding developed as you proceeded through your career, wherein the family was/is supportive of your professional goals.
B. Your family has/did not place you in a position wherein you had to choose between family or professional goals.
C. Family obligations occassionally have taken a secondary position if your professional goals and requirements of your job were to be attained. However, you attempted to make it up to the family whenever the occasion(s) allowed.
D. You attempted to make a compromise decision between family and job, but rarely sacrificed the family.
E. Sometimes, demands of the job, i.e., time sensitive issues, demanded that you put more hours on the job than you would like.
46. In a position that you feel is not exactly what you want:
A. You do whatever is required and receive what you believe to be only minimal personal or professional satisfaction from the results of your efforts.
B. You consider the results of your efforts to be neglegible and in fact believe your efforts to be "dog work."
C. You consider your efforts to be professionally and personally rewarding even though you are not completely happy with your present position.
D. You have in retrospect, almost always derived personal satisfaction from your job regardless of your personal feelings toward the assignments.
E. You do what is required, knowing or hoping that the present assignment (occupation) is only a means to an end.
47. You accepted employment with your present company:
A. Thinking or knowing that it would be only a temporary assignment, carrying with it a promise or possibility that a better position would be available in a reasonable time.
B. Realizing that it was exactly what you wanted to do and had no desire for higher levels of aspiration.
C. Because of your specific or unique skills that were desired by the employer, who was willing to pay you commensurate with your proven abilities.
D. Because of your unique skills that were desired by the employer but you also set your remuneration schedule.
E. Because there were no other positions available or opportunities that suited you.
48. When you take a vacation:
A. You find it is most benefical to take one long vacation as opposed to several short vacation trips.
B. You fit your vacation schedule into what the organization will allow you to take.
C. You find it best to schedule your vacation with the needs and desires of your family.
D. You do not take long vacations (more than 2 weeks) because you recognize that you will have to work twice as hard to catch up on your work when you return.
E. You take vacations only for reasons of health.
49. How good is your health?
A. Poor - need rest and/or medical treatment to attack the rigorous of daily business activity.
B. Based upon your judgement and substantiated by your physicians evaluation you are in good health for your age.
C. Based upon your judgement and supported by your physicians evaluation you are in better health then someone of your age.
D. Fair - you recognize the need to keep yourself physically toned up, but your demanding schedule has precluded you from adhering to a set exercise schedule.

## SECTION THREE

> Please answer the following questions in the present tense, i.e., how would you decide today, not how you decided in the past. Indicate your response in the box to the right of each question. The number preceeding the solid vertical line corresponds to the question number in the appropriate box. Disregard the numbers to the right of the boxes.
50. You have decided to terminate a company executive who is a personal friend. Which best describes what you would do?
A. Discuss the matter with him over the telephone.
B. Delegate the act of termination to someone else.
C. Delay notification until an opportune time.
D. Write a memo specifying the termination and its reasons.
E. Discuss the matter with him directly.
51. Select the one situation which causes you the most conflict.
A. Your family accuses you of being married to your job, and demands more time with you.
B. You have been directed to reorganize your activity to a mode you objected to in the past.
C. Your company expects you to violate your personal ethics.
D. Your subordinate directly countermands your directions, however, his actions have lead to increased productivity.
E. You have a difference of opinion with your board of directors on the goals and objectives of the organization you head.
52. Your advisory board of ten members disagrees with you on an issue in which you strongly believe. What is the highest level of opposition you would tolerate before yielding to board advice?

$$
\underline{\text { FOR } \quad \text { AGAINST }}
$$

| A. | 0 | - | 10 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | ---: |
| B. | 2 | - | 8 |
| C. | 3 | - | 7 |
| D. | 4 | - | 6 |
| E. | 5 | - | 5 |

53. Assume that for some reason a very close friend is forced to find another job. Some of the companies he has contacted are new and although their future success is uncertain, they offer potential salaries above that which he is now receiving. Indicate which company you would advise your friend to join.

CHANCES FOR COMPANY SUCCESS PROSPECTIVE SALARY INCREASE
A.
2 in 10
200\%
B. 4 in 10 100\%
C.
6 in 10 50\% D. 8 in 10 25\%
E. Survival Guaranteed 0\%
54. Your company has grown significantly in the past two years, and is now at capacity. You are considering expansion into a revolutionary new product line. The potential for a substantial return on investment is high if you enter now but will diminish rapidly if you delay. What would you do?
A. Do more research before making a decision.
B. Limit expansion to current product line.
C. Pursue it no further.
D. Invest in new product line.
E. Seek expansion through merger.
55. Indicate the one best description of your actions while working under tight time constraints for a considerable period.
A. You delegate part of your tasks.
B. You continually seek additional tasks to be performed.
C. You set aside part of the work for another time.
D. You set up a priority for the tasks, then follow the priority.
E. You are still open to ideas for additional tasks.
56. How frequently do you feel you have been right when faced with making decisions which are not backed with factual material?
A. Less than $50 \%$ of the time.
B. $50-60 \%$ of the time.
C. $60-70 \%$ of the time.
D. $70-80 \%$ of the time.
E. Greater than $80 \%$ of the time.

You manage a medium sized construction firm and recently learned of a new building material which is used extensively in Europe but has never been adopted in the United States. The building material appears to have several advantages in terms of substantial cost reduction, superior insulation qualities, and relative ease in construction as compared to its counterpart in the United States.

After a thorough investigation, one of your engineers obtained extensive and reliable information on the characteristics, costs, and advantages of the new material. Further, your company could easily obtain exclusive manufacturing rights for use in the United States.

Indicate which of the following would best describe your approach to the building material.
A. Utilize the new idea in the firm's next major building project so as to take advantage of the substantial cost savings.
B. Use the building material in one of the firm's small, local building projects so as to test its acceptance.
C. Construct a non-commercial prototype.
D. Engage the services of an independent consultant.
E. Wait until the building material has received considerable commercial application in the United States.
8. It has been brought to your attention that two of your key people have had a fight. The conflict continues to adversely affect the performance of their departments. What would you do?
A. Attempt to resolve the issue with each individual separately.
B. Do not get involved; let them resolve the issue themselves.
C. Call a conference to identify issues and resolve differences.
D. Direct them to drop the issue and get on with business.
E. Listen to the case, make judgement, and take appropriate action.
9. You and several others have been competing for the Chief Executive Office (CEO) position, which you confidently expected to receive and highly desire. You were just informed that a young "tiger" has been selected for the position, and you consider him to be less competent than you. You have received a memo from the retiring CEO to bring the new CEO up to speed. What would you do?
A. Resign.
B. Give token conformance and let the new CEO meet the challenge on his own.
C. Accept the assignment.
D. Take time off to think about the situation.
E. Accept the assignment, while looking for a position in another company.
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## Please think about what you do in your

 job in relation to handling subordinates. Indicate in the box to the right the one that best describes what you do.60. A. I feel that accepted plans should generally represent the OR ideas of my subordinates.
B. I expect subordinates to carry out plans I have prepared.
61. A. I am not so concerned with establishing close personal relationships as in getting subordinates to follow my OR example.
B. I develop a close personal relationship with subordinates because I believe this marks out a good manager.
62. A. I believe that firm discipline is important to keep the OR work moving.
B. I think that disciplining employees does more harm than good.
63. A. I am constantly concerned with high standards of performOR ance and encourage subordinates to reach these standards.
B. When a subordinate fails to perform I let him know of the failure in a firm and reasoned manner.
64. A. I think that subordinates should be able to overcome difOR ficulties in the way to achievement themselves.
B. When alternatives are described to me $I$ am not long in indicating the course of action I prefer.
65. A. When I make a decision, I take the additional step of OR persuading my subordinates to accept it.
B. I believe that subordinates should not be too discouraged by setbacks in the job, but rather should be able to clear blockages themselves.
66. A. In the long run, I will fire a man I consider to be OR unmanageable.
B. I discourage arguments which upset the harmony amongst subordinates.
67. A. I reward good work and feel that punishment for nonOR performance has limited use.
B. When I discipline a subordinate I am definite in letting him know what he has done wrong.

```
                    APPENDIX D
                    Keypunch Instructions
    The data from the test instrument "Executive Judgmental
Perceptions" (APPENDIX C) was transferred to two 80 column cards for
processing by the SPSS package on the computer. To describe the
input form of the data, this appendix provides the keypunch locations in
the first section and peculiar coding conventions of specific questions
in the second section.
```

APPENDIX D<br>Keypunch Instructions

## SECTION I

The following is the definition of the data locations on the 80 column cards for keypunching purposes. All data to be entered on the card is to be numeric only.

## KEYPUNCH LOCATIONS

CARD 1

| DATA ENTRY | CARD COL. | DATA ENTRY | CARD COL. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Question 1 Response | 1 | Question 26 Response | 37 |
| Question 2 Response | 2 | Question 27 Response | 38 |
| Question 3 Response | 3-4 | Question 28 Response | 39 |
| Question 4 Response | 5-6 | Question 29 Response | 40 |
| Question 5 Response | 7 | Question 30 Response | 41 |
| Question 6 Response | 8-9 | Question 31 Response | 42 |
| Question 7 Response | 10-12 | Question 32 Response | 43 |
| Question 8 Response | 13 | Question 33 Response | 44 |
| Question 9 Response | 14-15 | Question 34 Response | 45 |
| Question 10 Response | 16 | Question 35 Response | 46 |
| Question 11 Response | 17 | Question 36 Response | 47 |
| Question 12 Response | 18 | Question 37 Response | 48 |
| Question 13 Response | 19 | Question 38 Response | 49 |
| Question 14 Response | 20-22 | Question 39 Response | 50 |
| Question 15 Response | 23-24 | Question 40 Response | 51 |


| DATA ENTRY | CARD COL. |  | DATA ENTRY |  |
| :--- | :---: | :--- | :---: | :---: |
|  | CARD COL. |  |  |  |
| Question 16 Response | $25-26$ |  | Question 41 Response | 52 |
| Question 17 Response | $27-28$ |  | Question 42 Response | 53 |
| Question 18 Response | 29 |  | Question 43 Response | 54 |
| Question 19 Response | 30 |  | Question 44 Response | 55 |
| Question 20 Response | 31 |  | Question 45 Response | 56 |
| Question 21 Response | 32 |  | Question 46 Response | 57 |
| Question 22 Response | 33 |  | Question 47 Response | 58 |
| Question 23 Response | 34 | Question 48 Response | 59 |  |
| Question 24 Response | 35 | Question 49 Response | 60 |  |
| Question 25 Response | 36 | Questionnaire Code |  |  |

CARD 2

| DATA ENTRY | CARD COL. |
| :---: | :---: |
| Questionnaire Code |  |
| Number | 1-3 |
| Data Received | 4-8 |
| Question 50 Response | 10 |
| Question 51 Response | 11 |
| Question 52 Response | 12 |
| Question 53 Response | 13 |
| Question 54 Response | 14 |
| Question 55 Response | 15 |
| Question 56 Response | 16 |
| Question 57 Response | 17 |
| Question 58 Response | 18 |
| Question 59 Response | 19 |
| Question 60 Response | 20 |
| Question 61 Response | 21 |
| Question 62 Response | 22 |
| Question 63 Response | 23 |
| Question 64 Response | 24 |
| Question 65 Response | 25 |
| Question 66 Response | 26 |
| Question 67 Response | 27 |

## SECTION II

Special Coding - special coding was required to convert alphabetic data into numeric codes adaptable to ADP processing. The following describes the coding used:
a. Questions $1,3,5,8,10,12,15,18,19$ and 22 are coded within the question on the instrument itself.
b. In all other cases (except questions 34 and 36) the following code applies:
$A=1$
$B=2$
$C=3$
$D=4$
$E=5$
c. For questions 34 and 36 the following code applies:
$A=0 \quad E=4 \quad I=8$
$B=1 \quad F=5 \quad J=9$
$C=2 \quad G=6$
$D=3 \quad H=7$
d. Questions 2, 11, 18 and 21 have their responses coded by means of grouping the data. The detailed groupings are displayed in the following tables.

# QUESTION 2: POSITION HELD WITHIN ORGANIZATION PRIVATE SECTOR POPULATION 

Group 1
Chairman
Chairman \& C.E.O.
C.E.O.
C.E.O. \& President

President and Chairman
President
Chairman, President \& Acc't Executive
Chairman, President \& C.E.O.

Group 2
Vice Chairman \& Executive Officer
Vice Chairman

Group 3
Executive V.P.
Vice President
V.P. Production
V.P. Marketing Research
V.P. International Ops
V.P. Research \& New Acquisitions
V.P. General Manager
V.P. Manufacturing Staff
V.P. Finance

Senior V.P. Sales
Senior V.P.

Group 4
Administrative Assistant, Corporate

General Manager
Financial Manager
Associate (F.M. Consult)
Inter-nation Marketing Manager
Senior Staff Officer (Law and Finance)

Public Affairs Officer
Manager, MPR, PLG, and DEV
Assistant Corporation Controller

Group 5
Self Employed

| Group 1-Hard Science (Eng.) | Group 4 - Business |
| :--- | :--- |
| Electronics | Business Administration |
| Mechanical \& Elec. Eng. | Accounting |
| Civil Engineering | Business |
| Electrical Engineering | Business Management |
| Industrial Engineering | Finance |
| Engineering | Public Administration |
| Aero Engineering | Industrial Relations |
| Mechanical Engineering | Marketing |
| Group 2-Hard Sciences (0ther) | CPA |
| Medicine | Industrial Administration |
| Pharmacy | Industrial Science |
| Zoology | Group 5 - Overlapping Fields |
| Science | Engineering \& Business |
| Chemistry, Physics, Biology | Group 6 - Miscellaneous Fields |
| Chemistry | Agriculture \& Education |
| Mathematics | Agriculture |

## Group 3 - Soft Sciences

Social Science
Economics
History
Philosophy
Liberal Arts
Law
Economics \& Law
Education

## Group 7

Greater than High School, but less than Bachelors level

PRIVATE SECTOR POPULATION
Elaboration of religious denomination preferences (responses 4 and 5, question 18).

Response 4 (Religious preference, other)
Greek Orthodox
Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints
Agnostic
Response 5 (Protestant denomination preference)
Protestant (No affiliation/preference)
Presbyterian
Epsicopalian
Congregational
Lutheran
Methodist
Baptist

## QUESTION 21: FATHERS' OCCUPATION PRIVATE SECTOR POPULATION

| Group 1-Blue Collar | Oil Field Super. | Insurance Salesman |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Fireman | V.P. Production | Sales Manager |
| Mechanic | Metallurgist | Retail Lumber |
| Plumber | Executive | Indust. Set-Up Man |
| Tailor | Sec. of High Comm. | Inspector |
| Trainman | Financial Manager | County Registrar |
| Clerk | Financial Executive | Owner of Business |
| Chef | Industrialist | Grocer |
| Laborer | Group 3-Prof. (Low) | Estate Manager |
| Railroad Agent | Selling Executive | Group 5-Agriculture |
| Railroad Conductor | Broker | Farming |
| Police | Consulting Investor | Cattleman |
| Group 2-Prof. (High) | Building Engineer |  |
| Engineer | Editor/Publisher |  |
| Attorney | Printer |  |
| Educator | Manufacturing |  |
| Doctor | Group 4-White Collar |  |
| Dentist | Wholesaler |  |
| Minister | Business Manager |  |
| Chairman of Corporation President of The Corp. | Manager V.A. Hospital |  |


| Group 2-Prof. (High) |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Proup 4-White Collar |  |
| V.P. very large Corp. |  |
| Banker | Contractor |
| Business Executive | Merchant |
| Industrial Executive | Selling |
| Importer | Whole Paper Dealer |

## QUESTION 2: POSITION HELD WITHIN ORGANIZATION PUBLIC SECTOR POPULATION

Because of the extreme variety of responses, no attempt was made to code the responses to this question.

| Group 1-Hard Sciences (Eng.) | Group 4-Business |
| :--- | :--- |
| Engineer | International Transportation |
| Aero Engineer | Personnel Administration |
| Electrical Engineer | Finance |
| Civil Engineer | Public Administration |
| Mechanical Engineer | Business |
| Nuclear Engineer | Accounting |
| Group 2-Hard Sciences (Other) | Systems Management |
| Physics | Management |
| Oceanography | Engineering Management |
| Chemistry | Industrial Management |
| Geo-Physics | Business and Public Policy |
| Physics/Math |  |
| Mathematics | Group 5-Other |
| Meterology | Control Systems |
| Science | Research and Development |
| Physiology | Technical |
| Esychology |  |
| Law Soft Science |  |
| Educational Tech |  |

## QUESTION 18: RELIGIOUS PREFERENCE PUBLIC SECTOR POPULATION

Elaboration of religiious denomination preference (responses 4 and 5, question 18).

Response 4 (religious preference, other)
Unitarian
Response 5 (Protestant denomination preference)
Protestant (No preference/affiliation)
Presbyterian
Episcopalian
Congregational
Lutheran

Baptist
Methodist
Nazarene
Unitarian
Disciples of Christ

| Group 1-Blue Collar | Oil Worker | Group 3-Prof. (Low) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Laborer | Mechanic | Business Manager |
| Typesetter | Photo Engraver | Restauranteur |
| Plumber | Roofer | Self Employed |
| Train Dispatcher | Nurseryman | Credit Manager |
| Tailor | Bricklayer | Retail Food |
| Baker | Brakeman | Stock Broker |
| Prospector | Aircraft Exam. | Cigar Manufacturer |
| Carpenter | Computer Oper. | Sales Manager |
| Postman | Railroad Conduct. | Businessman |
| Service Station Oper. | Railroad Eng. | Laundry Owner |
| Production Foreman | Clerk | Aircraft Mgmt. Company |
| Financial Clerk | Electrician | Housing Project Mgr. |
| Police Clerk | Construction Wkr. | Manufacturer |
| Dry Cleaner | Foreman | Printer |
| Timekeeper | Military | Management Consultant |
| Utility Man | Wire Drawer | Manufacturing Management |
| Clerical Worker |  |  |
| Textile Worker | Group 2-Prof. (High) |  |
| Railroad Lineman | Doctor Engineer |  |
| Truck Driver | Minister Dentist |  |
| Gardener | Educator |  |
| Saw Filer | Lawyer |  |


| Group 1-Blue Collar | Group 2-Prof. (High |
| :---: | :---: |
| Meatpacker | Pharmacist |
| Mill Worker | Economist |
| Racehorse Trainer | University Prof. |
|  | Naval Officer |
| Group 4-White Collar | Group 5-Agriculture |
| Real Estate | Cattleman |
| Salesman | Sheepman |
| Insurance Broker | Farmer |
| Contractor | Rancher |
| Superintendent |  |
| Insurance Salesman |  |
| Corporate Secretary |  |
| Building Contractor |  |
| Lumber Company |  |
| Small Business Owner |  |
| Fund Raiser |  |
| CPA |  |
| Tobacco Buyer |  |
| Shop Manager |  |
| Merchant |  |
| Newspaper Advertising |  |
| Assessor |  |
| Accountant |  |

Group 4-White Collar
Storekeeper
U.S. Govt. (Civil Service)

Furrier
Draftsman
Marketing
Vehicle Maintenance Manager

## APPENDIX E

To allow the reader to interpret the raw data responses to each question, this appendix provides an individual histogram of the responses received for each question from each population. The histograms are followed immediately by the appropriate statistics applying to that question, population, and responses received. For ease of comparison, the responses to one question from each of the sub-populations as well as the total are displayed on one page.

The display format used has the combined population responses in the upper left hand portion of each page, the Executive population in the upper right hand portion, the "Super" population in the lower left hand portion, and the GS-15/14/13 population in the lower right hand portion of each page. The word immediately following the term "file" at the head of each histogram describes the population from which the responses were received. The term VAR refers to the variable or question number from the questionnaire. A brief name has been assigned each question and follows the term VAR $\qquad$ at the head of each histogram. The " X " axis displays the frequency of response with the " Y " axis providing the coded responses to the question. For ease of interpretation the questionnaire responses are provided following each histogram line.


| MEAN | 4.131 | 8 TO ENR |  | MEDIAN |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| MODE | 2.000 | Sid OEV | 2.074 | VAMIANCE | 7.149 |
| KURTUS 18 | 8.418 | AKEANES ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | 1.794 | Hance | 23.000 |
| MINIMUM | 1.000 | maximum | 24.000 | Bum | 1297.000 |
| C.V. PCt | 64.731 | . 95 C.1. | 3.434 | 10 | 4.427 |
| Vablo cases | 314 | missing | 4 |  |  |
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| MFAM | 1.930 | 310 |  | ． 031 | MEDTAN | 1.902 | MEAN | 1．010 | 970 | 明年 |  | ． 027 | 4ET |  | 1.09 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| MODE | 2.000 | 110 |  | ． 298 | VARIANCE | ． 0.000 | MODE | 2，nno | 875 | Or $V$ |  | ． 274 | VART | NP．E | O7 |
| ＊，metubis | 9，210 | 8 Kt | \％iss | －3．35 ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | manfer | 1.000 | ku＊pors | \％， 388 | g＊em | anes 3 |  | －3，064 | －anc |  | 1.00 |
| －1ヶ\％m＊ | 1.000 | ＊at | Mい | 2.000 | sum | 137.000 | －Jnimum | 1．0no | max | （M1） |  | 2.000 | su＊ |  | 23 A .00 |
| C．V．© ${ }^{\text {c }}$ | 13.354 | ． 95 | 6． 6. | 1.869 | 10 | 1．091 | c．v．Pe？ | 14.302 | ． 95 | c．i． |  | 1.870 |  | T\％ | 1.94 |
| VAbIO CAEEA | P1 | $\cdots 18$ | IAG | 0 |  |  | VALID Cases | 123 | mis | INO | cases | 0 |  |  |  |
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| MEAN | 90.170 | 610 ERA |  | .197 | median | 90.731 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| MOOE | 10.000 | S10 OEV |  | 3.500 | VARIANCE | 12.305 |
| kuRTCsis | 2.002 | ORENAESS |  | -1.303 | hange | 22,000 |
| HINImum | 56.000 | MAxImum |  | 96.000 | sum | 22314.000 |
| C. V. PCT | 4.999 | .95 C.1. |  | 69.783 | 10 | 90.55\% |
| VALIU CASEB | 318 | H165IMG | cases | 0 |  |  |
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| PAGE | 35 In AUA 96 | PIIE ExEC | ATEO 16 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |


| mear | 1.131 | STO ERR |  | ． 020 | HEDIAN | 1.072 | MEAN | 1.203 | 397 EQR |  | ． 038 | MFDIAN |  | 1.11 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Mnde | 1.000 | 3tO DEv |  | ． 338 | VARIANCE | ． 128 |  | 1.003 2.094 | Sin ofv |  | .0320 1.904 | VARI |  | H11 |
| Kurtisis | 5.952 | SxENME58 |  | 2.581 | manct | 2.000 | kuatasts | 2．0n4 | narimigm |  | 3.090 | Sum |  | $14 \mathrm{~A},{ }^{\text {a }}$ |
| MINTMM | 1.000 | MAXIMCM |  | 3.000 | sum | 350.000 | P，V，PCP | 35.227 | ． 95 C．I． |  | 1.129 | in |  | 1.20 |
| G．V．DCT | 31.040 | ． 95 C．1． |  | 1.091 | 10 | 1.173 | ？．V．PCT | 35.227 | －95 C．． |  | 1.12 |  |  |  |
| vallo eases | 300 | MIssIng | CASEs | － |  |  | VALIO CASES | 123 | MIs TNG | cases | 1 |  |  |  |



|  | 1．012 | 310 | Ean | ． 031 | MFDIAN | 1.039 | MEAN | 1.000 | 590 | E日者 |  | － 030 | Ment |  |  | 1.04 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| MODP | 1．000 | 870 |  | ．261 | VAFIANCE | ． 008 | MOnP | 1．0na | 590 | nfy |  | ． 321 | VAP？ | veE |  | ． 10 |
| xunr）318 | 0.818 | ¢x | anes 9 | 3.298 | HANGE | 1.000 | KURTクSTS | 12，906 | 5＊e | NESS |  | 3.535 | Qang |  |  | 2.10 |
| min！mum | 1.000 | max | mum | 2.000 | $8{ }^{84}$ | 74.000 | minimum | 1.006 | Max | M14 |  | \＄．000 | sum |  |  | $1>A, A+$ |
| C．V．Det | 24.351 | ． 95 | C．I． | 1.010 | 10 | 1.135 | C．V．Det | 29．357 | ． 95 | c． 1. |  | 1.035 |  |  |  | 1.15 |
| VALIO CABES | $\cdots$ | $\sim 18$ | ING | 2 |  |  | VALIO CASPs | 117 | － 19 | ING | CASE8 | ＊ |  |  |  |  |
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| Wean | 18,240 |  | 875 | E** |  |  | URTIAN |  | $\begin{aligned} & 19.1 n n \\ & 0 ? .220 \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| WORE | 10.000 |  | 879 | DPv |  |  | vaPtance |  |  |
| xuetnsts | -.3ae |  | 8 ck | Hipls |  |  | - ange |  | 34.098 |
| MinImu4 | 5.0n0 | , | max | mim |  |  | suw |  | 222A.non |
| c.v. © ${ }^{\text {P }}$ | 43.231 |  | . 09 | C. 1. |  |  |  | 10 | 19.480 |
| VA1.in Casps | 122 |  | 419 | ING |  | 1 |  |  |  |
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| *EAH | 2.420 | 370 EWA |  | . 144 | MEDIAN | 2.848 | WEAN | 3.029 | 51 n | EQa | . 120 |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| mOD | 3.00 u | BTO CEV |  | 1.208 | VARIANCE | 1.459 | monf | 2,009 | 3tn | n¢ $V$ | 1.320 | VARI |  | 2.423 |
| 2umests | -. 974 | 8kFmats |  | . 237 | HANGE | 4.000 | kurTnais | -1.129 | 3*e | NF39 | , 25 A | Van |  | 1.943 4.000 |
| *IN1世um | 1.000 | maximum |  | 5.000 | $)^{\text {um }}$ | 205.000 | MINImu* | 1.000 | Max |  | 5.100 | sum |  | a,non $309.00 n$ |
| $c, v, \cdots$ ! | 41.230 | .99 C.l. |  | 2.041 | 10 | 3.217 | C.V.Pr! | 43.492 | . 05 | C. 1. | 2.7A ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | Sum | 97 | 3.2ht |
| valio casea | 90 | -188146 | Casts | 1 |  |  | valio cases | 122 | M15 | ING |  |  |  |  |
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| HEAN | 1.921 | Stc ear |  | . 159 | median | . 388 | mean | 3.404 | STOEDE |  | . 324 | -EAIAM | ?.333 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| - $20 \%$ | -0 | STO OEV |  | 2.839 | VAMIANLE | A.047 | MnTE | - $n$ | STA DFV |  | 3.605 | VARIANCE | 17.979 |
| xupusis | . 542 |  |  | 1.307 | Ranct | 9.000 | *uetosis | -1.501 | Skewifss |  | . 349 | SANSE | 9.009 |
| MINImum | 0 | Maxtmum |  | 9.007 | Sum | 111.300 | *INIVUM | 0 | Maximiju |  | 9.000 |  | $427.0 n 0$ |
| Cov. PC\% | 107.040 | . 95 C. 1. |  | 1.000 | 10 | 2.234 | c.v. PCP | 100.692 | . $95 \mathrm{c.l}$. |  | 2.RD3 | T | H.0.04 |
| vablo cases | 318 | -1831NG | CASES | 0 |  |  | valit cases | 124 | M\%*S!NG | CASEs | $n$ |  |  |
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4.00 ( 11 )

$0 \stackrel{1}{\bullet \bullet} 1 \quad 1)$
(MISQING)


| 2.109 | MEAN | 2.537 | STM ERA | .129 | MEDIAN | 2.306 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1.911 | - ${ }^{\text {¢ }}$ | 1.AnO | 3Tก ガV | 1.404 | VariancF | 1.973 |
| a, 000 | kuatns is | -1.0n3 | 3XFWNES9 | -4n9 | Qatree | a.con |
| 758.000 | MINIMM | 1.000 | maximum | 5.010 | sum | 31).A0C |
| 2.595 | C.V. PCT | 55.301 | . 95 C.1. | 2. 2Ab | In | 2.787 |
|  | valin cases | 123 | misalng cases | 1 |  |  |
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| - 4 \# | 2.300 | 890 हR | . 151 | MEOIAN | 2.389 | TEAN | 2.900 | 370 | EAR |  | . 130 | mPDIAN | 2.1 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| -002 | 1.000 | 910 DEV | 1.267 | VAMIANCE | 1.004 | mone | $3.0 n 0$ |  | AFV |  | 1.416 | VAPIANCE | $2 ; 1$ |
| numius 13 | 0.307 | SKENNE58 | .0.28 | mange | 4,000 | KURTASts | -1.10 ${ }^{\circ}$ | SkE | Ans: |  | . 152 | Qange | a, 1 |
| mINIMUM | 1.000 | maximum | 3.000 | gum | 161.000 | Minimum | 1.000 | may | mum |  | 5.100 | SUM | 322,1 |
| C.V. V\% | \$9.091 | . 95 C.I. | 1.908 | 10 | 2,002 | C.V. ${ }^{\text {ef }}$ | 52.345 | . 95 | C.1. |  | 2.449 | T 7 | 2.1 |
| VALIO Casea | 10 | -1831~G | 1 |  |  | valin cases | 119 | 418 | ING | Case 8 | 4 |  |  |
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|  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1.00 | ****** ! |  | 12) |
|  | 14 |  |  |
|  | 1 |  |  |
| 2.00 | ******* | ( | 14) |
|  | 1 1 |  |  |






| MEAN | 3.000 | ST? ERR |  | . 144 | MEOTAN | 2.929 | - EAN | $3.13{ }^{1}$ | STD FRQ | . 114 | MFDIAN | 3.01 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| mnor | 3.000 | BT? DEV |  | . 788 | VARIANCE | .621 | Mnar | 3.1n0 | 3 9TO CV | 1.725 | Vartance | 3.4 |
| mutics 10 | 2.000 | SKEANES8 |  | 1.291 | nange | 3.000 | Kueros 3 | -..427 | SKEWNESA | -1A1 | RANGE | 1. |
| 41 mlw | 2.000 | maxlmum |  | 5.000 | sur | 90.000 | Min! Mum | 1.000 | mayImila | 5.1008 | 5 Sum | 3 An : ${ }^{\text {a }}$ |
| C.V. ${ }^{\text {ct }}$ | d0. 261 | . 95 c.l. |  | 2.700 | 10 | 3.290 | C.V. Prt | 39.129 | .09 C.I. | 2.904 | in | 3.31 |
| VALIO CAste | 30 | *IBsING | cases | 41 |  |  | VALIO CASES | 195 | mISSING CASFS | A |  |  |
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| MEA4 | 4. 261 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| mOOR | 5.000 | S10 OEV |  | .181 | MEDIA | 0.718 | MEAN | 3.959 | 570 | EQa |  | . 097 | -FAIAN | 4.070 |
| kuatusts | -1.190 | BKEMAEBS |  | 1.023 | VARIGNCE | 1.047 | MODE | 5.000 |  |  |  | 1.007 | VAPISNCE | 1.144 |
| MIMImum | 2.000 | mayimur |  | 1.788 5.000 | MANGE | 3.000 | KUATCSIB | -1.457 | SKE | NESA |  |  | Q ante | 4.000 |
| C.V. ${ }^{\text {ct }}$ | 21.905 | .95 C.l. |  | 3.000 | 8 ck | 137.000 | MINIVUM | 1.000 | MAX | mim |  | 5.000 | S 114 | 479.000 |
|  |  | -93 C. |  | 3.912 | 10 | 4.050 | C.V.Prt | 20.971 | . 95 | C. 1. |  | 1.707 | 74 | 4.151 |
| valio cases | 32 | M1831NG | CABEA | 36 |  |  | VALI? Pases | 121 | M 18 | ING | Casfs | 2 |  |  |





VAROAS POWRRS
1.00
2.00
(MissInc)


| MEAN | 1.259 | STO ERa |  | .030 | median | 1.173 | 4 Am | 1.411 |  |  | - ABA | WFOIAN |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| MOD | 1.000 | 3ti dev |  | . 438 | Vamiance | 1.173 .192 | 4 DOF | 1.000 |  |  | - 496 | VAPIANCE |
| Kuetus | -.705 | SREMEAB |  | 1.111 | RINTSE | 1.000 | kuptasts | - I, Ans | SKF | NES ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | . 363 | ANE? |
| MINImum | 1.000 | maximum |  | 2.000 | sum | 204.000 | MINI MUM | 1.000 | M $4 \times$ | MUM | 2.010 | Su* |
| C.v. PCT | 34.8409 | .05 C .1. |  | 1.190 | 10 | 1.319 | C.V. Pet | 35.109 | . 95 | C. 1. | 1.278 | P |
| VALIO CAsEs | 210 | MISSING | CABEs | 108 |  |  | valin cases | 46 | mis | ING | 68 |  |







| Hetar | 1.394 | 890 EmF |  | . 034 | median | 1.325 | MEAN | 1.304 | 397 |  |  | . 062 | mentan | 1.210 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| - COE | 1.000 | 815 DEV |  | .490 | VARIANCE | . 240 | 4Cnf | $1.0 n 0$ | 970 |  |  | -484 | vagitvee | - $1^{\circ}$ |
| * clusis $^{\text {a }}$ | -1.e13 | SAEANES |  | .433 | HANGE | 1.000 | kuains 18 | -1.290 | 3 KF | aras |  | . A54 | Q $\triangle$ NGE | $1:$ Anct |
| aivlmum | 1.000 | maximum |  | 2.000 | sum | 200.000 | minquum | 1.000 | max | 101m |  | 2.000 | 3 ym | 71.par |
| C.V. Dey | 35.135 | .es C.b. |  | 1.327 | 10 | 1.401 | C.V. Pep | 35.40? | -99 | C. 1. |  | 1.170 | 10 | 1.42? |
| vablo cases | 208 | mIssIng | cabes | 110 |  |  | valin cases | 56 | 413 | ING | casts | 6 A |  |  |






## APPENDIX F

This appendix depicts the results of analysis on each question. The analysis utilized either the $\chi^{2}$ non-parametric test of significant difference in responses or the parametric "t" test for situations requiring its use. Section one displays the results of comparisons of the responses of one sub-population against another to determine whether the responses, in fact, were statistically different (at the $\mathbf{9 5 \%}$ level of confidence). Section two displays the results of the comparison of the individual questions to what was expected based upon the authors interpretation of the management literature. Section three describes in one table how the questions were grouped with respect to each capacity indicator.

## SECTION IA

This section describes the results of the analysis of questions 60-68 (61 is a null question). A "t" test was performed for comparison since only two responses were possible: Either a power oriented response or non-power oriented response. The results of this comparison are shown in Table $\mathrm{F}-1$ with the following definitions applicable:

VARIABLE $=$ Question number from test instrument
DF $\quad=$ Degrees of Freedom computed
DIFF $\quad=$ Indicates whether responses are statistically different
"t" $=t$ value computed for comparison of two populations indicated

For the purposes of summarizing the power responses to achieve a cumulative measure for the power indicator the following was performed:
A. The responses to the questions were summed with respect to the total number of power-oriented responses per instrument.
B. This total per instrument was then displayed in the following Table (Table F-2).
C. The data was summarized into groups of $0-2$ power responses, 3-4 power responses, and $5-7$ power responses.
D. Chi-Square analysis was then performed with the results shown in Table 3 of the report.

| VARIABLE |  |  | EXEC/SUPER |  |  | EXEC/GS 15/14/13 |  |  | SUPER/GS 15/14/15 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | "t" | DF | DIFF | "t" | DF | DIFF | "t" | DF | DIFF |
| 060 | Power | 1 | 1.865 | 86 | No | . 424 | 175 | No | -1.745 | 151 | No |
| 062 | Power | 3 | -1.335 | 84 | No | -. 659 | 173 | No | . 946 | 151 | No |
| 063 | Power | 4 | 2,900 | 86 | Yes | 2.655 | 176 | Yes | 1.203 | 152 | No |
| 064 | Power | 5 | -. 015 | 84 | No | . 801 | 176 | No | . 804 | 151 | No |
| 065 | Power | 6 | -1.542 | 86 | No | -1.439 | 174 | No | . 524 | 150 | No |
| 066 | Power | 7 | -. 702 | 86 | No | 2.068 | 176 | Yes | -. 844 | 152 | No |
| 067 | Power | 8 | . 313 | 86 | No | . 074 | 176 | No | -. 291 | 152 | No |

TABLE F-2
CUMULATIVE POWER RESPONSES by POPULATION

| POWER RESPONSES | EXEC | SUPER | GS 15/14/13 | ALL |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 0 | 1 | 0 | 5 | 6 |
| 1 | 1 | 8 | 9 | 18 |
| 2 | 7 | 3 | 21 | 31 |
| 3 | 12 | 8 | 30 | 50 |
| 4 | 14 | 4 | 25 | 43 |
| 5 | 15 | 7 | 20 | 42 |
| 6 | 5 | 1 | 12 | 18 |
| 7 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 3 |
| TOTAL | 57 | 32 | 122 | 211 |

SECTION IB
This section describes the results of the Chi-Square analysis of questions 3 through 59 to determine how the responses of one population compare with another. The results are displayed in Table F-3 with the following definitions applying:

VARIABLE $=$ Question number from test instrument
$x^{2}=$ Chi-Square value computed for two populations indicated

DF $\quad=$ Degrees of Freedom computed
SIG = Level of significance of the test; . 05 corresponds to a $95 \%$ confidence in the responses being different

DIFF = Indicates whether responses are statistically different
TABLE F-3
SNOILSANO TVMaInIGNI AO NOSICY

|  |  | ${ }_{\text {cs }}^{15}$ |  |  | ${ }_{\substack{\text { csi } \\ \text { Op } \\ \text { I }}}$ | ${ }_{\text {stc }}^{13}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 4 4.82 |  | . 0000 |  |  |  |
| . 0375 | 94.07 | ${ }^{39}$ | .0000 | 42.40 | ${ }^{3}$ | . 1528 |
| .884 | 0.00 | 1 | 1.0000 | .00 | 1 | .934 |
| . 1376 | ${ }^{23.01}$ | 22 | . 6011 | 22.20 | 20 | . 329 |
| . 539 | 54.25 | 56 | .5414 | 65.89 | 51 | .0784 |
| . 2094 | 4.15 | 3 | .2461 | 3.64 | 4 | . 477 |
| . 019 | 69.87 | 46 | .0131 | 63.37 | ${ }^{38}$ | .0060 |
| .0001 | 32.65 | 7 | .0000 | 25.48 | , | .006 |
| . 0193 | 43.76 | 6 | .0000 | ${ }^{17.61}$ | 4 | . 0015 |
| .0400 | 7.63 | 3 | .0543 | 10.53 | 4 | .032 |
| .0699 | 6.29 | 2 | .0431 | 0.61 | 2 | .1334 |
| .5849 | 1.77 | 5 | .8794 | ${ }^{7} .21$ | 5 | .2088 |
| 0415 | 4.86 | 4 | . 3022 | ${ }^{8.11}$ | 4 | . 087 |
| n/4 | w/A | w/A | x/4 | w/A | N/4 | N/4 |
| . 0281 | 38.07 | 10 | .0000 | 22.16 | 10 | . 014 |
| . 069 | 34.92 | 13 | .0099 | 18.08 | 14 | . 230 |
| .998 | 67.67 | ${ }_{4}$ | .0124 | 41.80 | ${ }^{33}$ | .160 |
| . 013 | ${ }^{65.87}$ | 9 | .0000 | 52.19 | 9 | .0000 |
| . 7382 | 4.95 | 2 | .0843 | 1.52 | 1 | . 217 |
| . 3242 | 2.96 | 3 | . 373 | ${ }^{1.06}$ | 2 | .5988 |
| . 0162 | ${ }^{33.73}$ | 4 | .0000 | 9.12 | 4 | . 0881 |
| . 2186 | 3.17 | 1 | .0751 | 3/4 | w/A | w/a | EXEC/SUPER


|  | VARLABLE | $x^{2}$ | DF |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 003 | Location | 41.71 | 11 |
| 004 | Age | 51.28 | 35 |
| 005 | Sex | . 05 | 1 |
| 006 | Height | 13.87 | 18 |
| 007 | Weight | 43.42 | 45 |
| 008 | Race | 5.87 | 4 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 009 \\ & \text { Orga } \end{aligned}$ | Time With Present anization | 61.46 | 44 |
| 010 | Last Level Education | 30.01 | 7 |
| 011 | Major | 15.12 | 6 |
| 012 | Marital Status | 8.31 | 3 |
| 013 | Times Married | 5.32 | 2 |
| 141 | Son | 3.76 | 5 |
| 142 | Daughter | 11.55 | 5 |
| 143 | None | N/A | N/A |
| 015 | Spouses Education | 18.67 | 9 |
| $016$ | Different Organizations loyeed | 24.26 | 10 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 017 \\ & \text { Orga } \end{aligned}$ | Long Time Any anization | 43.83 | 42 |
| 018 | Religion | 27.16 | 9 |
| 019 | Changed Religion | 0.61 | 2 |
| 020 | Times Changed | 2.25 | 2 |
| 021 | Father Occupation | 12.16 | 4 |
| 022 | Citizen | 1.51 | 1 |


| $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & \cdots \\ & \vdots \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | 앙 |  | N - ? | $$ | $\underset{\sim}{\infty}$ | $$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { N } \\ & \underset{\sim}{N} \end{aligned}$ | $\stackrel{\uparrow}{\hat{\infty}}$ | $\underset{\sim}{N}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{N} \\ & \text { N. } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { no } \\ & \text { ల్ } \end{aligned}$ | ㅇ | $\begin{aligned} & \infty \\ & \text { © } \\ & \text { 이 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { N } \\ & \text { N } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { n } \\ & \text { © } \\ & \substack{0 \\ \hline} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \circ \\ & \substack{\infty \\ i \\ \hline} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & n \\ & \underset{\sim}{\infty} \\ & \infty \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & m \\ & \infty \\ & \infty \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { N } \\ & \text { No } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { N } \\ & \text { N } \\ & \text { N} \end{aligned}$ | $\stackrel{n}{n}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| y | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | m | m | $\checkmark$ | N | $\cdots$ | $N$ | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | $m$ | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ |
| い |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | ㅇ. |  | - | $\infty$ | O. | $\stackrel{+}{\square}$ | $\cdots$ | บ | $?$ |  | - | $\infty$. | O. | $\because$ | $\infty$ | $\stackrel{\sim}{*}$ | ? | $\infty$ | $\because$ | $\infty$ | 0 | $\bigcirc$ |
|  | $\bigcirc$ | $\cdots$ | m | $\infty$ | $\bigcirc$ |  | n | - | m | 0 | $\bigcirc$ |  |  | $a$ | 0 | N | $\cdots$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\square$ |  | $\cdots$ |  |


VARIABLE
023 Organizations Member of
024 New Friends
025 People Seen Daily
026 Making Important
Decisions
027 Work Related Decisions บоF7emiojuI pazeroy yxom 8 ¢O 029 Original Idea 030 Rely on Initial Information 031 Hear About New Idea 032 Information Concerning
Important Decision Important Decision
033 Number of Journals 033 Number of Journals
034 Salary Range 034 Salary Range
035 Lesser Salary 035 Lesser Salary
036 How Much 036 How Much
037 Why Not
038 Times to do Work 039 Time Spend at Work 040 Work Routine 041 Policy Accepted 042 Decision Maker 043 Maverick 044 Function at New Level
TABLE F-3
SNOILSGOD TVnaInIanI do NOSI\&甘dWOD
 3 THROUGH 59 BY POPULATION

## SECIION II

This section describes the analysis of all questions with respect to the expected responses based upon the authors interpretation of the management literature. Table F-4 displays the results of this analysis with the following definitions applying:

VARIABLE $=$ Question number from test instrument $x^{2}=$ Chi-Square value computed for the comparison of observed responses and expected responses based upon 1iterature
"t" = t values computed for the comparison of observed to expected responses

DF $\quad=$ Degrees of Freedom computed
DIFF = Indicates whether observed responses are significantly different than expected

The expected responses based upon interpretation of the literature are shown in Table F-5. Questions 23-49 expected responses are frot the Leshko and Vosseteig (1975) research and questions 50-68 are based upon the authors' interpretation of the literature.





| COMPARISON OF INDIVIDUAL QUESTION RESPONSES to management literature by population |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| variable |  |  | ${ }^{2}{ }_{\text {2 }}{ }_{\text {dF }}^{\text {ALL }}$ |  |  | EXEC |  |  | SUPER |  |  | GS 15/14/13 |  |  |
|  |  |  | DIFF | $x^{2}$ | DF | DIFF | $x^{2}$ | DF | DIFF | $x^{2}$ | DF | DIFF |
| 047 | Accept | d Euployee |  |  | 113.83 | 4 | Yes | 14.49 | 4 | Yes | 40.86 | 3 | Yes | 79.77 | 4 | Yes |
| 048 | Vacatio |  | 93.05 | 4 | Yes | 28.59 | 4 | Yes | 20.55 | 3 | Yes | 54.01 | 3 | Yes |
| 049 | Health |  | 30.00 | 4 | Yes | 10.55 | 4 | Yes | 6.94 | 3 | No | 2.83 | 3 | No |
| 050 | Termin | ate Friend | 116.73 | 4 | Yes | 34.94 | 2 | Yes | 19.61 | 2 | Yes | 62.61 | 3 | Yes |
| 051 | Confli | ct Situation | 57.06 | 3 | Yes | 1.81 | 2 | No | 13.43 | 2 | Yes | 27.65 | 3 | Yes |
| 052 | Board | Advice | 353.35 | 3 | Yes | 108.72 | 2 | Yes | 16.82 | 2 | Yes | 213.56 | 3 | Yes |
| 053 | Advise | Friend | 44.66 | 4 | Yes | 9.82 | 3 | Yes | 0.85 | 2 | No | 23.49 | 3 | Yes |
| $\begin{gathered} 054 \\ \text { Expe } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { New Pr } \\ & \text { periment } \end{aligned}$ | oduct | 42.69 | 3 | Yes | 14.96 | 3 | Yes | 0.30 | 1 | No | 14.20 | 3 | Yes |
| 055 | Tight | Time | 201.58 | 3 | Yes | 40.43 | 3 | Yes | 43.82 | 3 | Yes | 126.34 | 3 | Yes |
| $\begin{gathered} 056 \\ \text { Fact } \end{gathered}$ | Decision Without ts |  | 43.78 | 4 | Yes | 18.62 | 2 | Yes | 0.09 | 2 | No | 32.75 | 3 | Yes |
| 057 New Building Material |  |  | 134.43 | 3 | Yes | 44.88 | 2 | Yes | 10.67 | 1 | Yes | 76.27 | 2 | Yes |
| 058 Key People Conflict |  |  | 27.93 | 4 | Yes | 14.52 | 3 | Yes | 0.65 | 2 | No | 14.86 | 3 | Yes |
| 059 | CEO Position |  | 166.38 | 4 | Yes | 43.15 | 3 | Yes | 8.32 | 2 | Yes | 113.37 | 3 | Yes |
|  | variable |  | $\begin{array}{ll} \text { "t" } & \begin{array}{l} \text { ALL } \\ \mathrm{DF} \end{array} \\ \hline \end{array}$ |  | DIFF |  |  | SUPER |  |  |  | Gs 15/14/13 |  |  |
| $\overline{060}$ | Power | 1 | -9.516 | 416 | Yes | -5.360 | 263 | Yes | -6.467 | 239 | Yes | -7.749 | 328 | Yes |
| 062 | Power | 3 | . 531 | 412 | No | -0.304 | 259 | No | 1.168 | 237 | No | . 458 | 326 | No |
| 063 | Power | 4 | -9.585 | 418 | Yes | -3.772 | 264 | Yes | -6.468 | 240 | Yes | -8.988 | 330 | Yes |
| 064 | Power | 5 | -1.138 | 416 | Yes | -0.269 | 263 | No | -0.033 | 238 | No | -1.511 | 329 | No |
| 065 | Power | 6 | 1.469 | 414 | Yes | -0.204 | 262 | No | 1.467 | 238 | No | 1.622 | 326 | No |
| 066 | Power | 7 | -0.913 | 418 | Yes | -1.845 | 264 | No | -0.703 | 240 | No | 0.137 | 330 | No |
| 067 | Power | 8 | -4.565 | 416 | No | -2.897 | 263 | Yes | -2.707 | 240 | Yes | -3.897 | 329 | Yes |

TABLE F-5
LITERATURE EXPECTED RESPONSES
BY
APPLICABLE QUESTION NUMBER


Question 27

|  |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| R | $\frac{\text { L.E. } \%}{}$ |
| A | 35 |
| B | 32 |
| C | 28 |
| D | 3 |
| E | 2 |

Question 31
$\frac{\text { R }}{\text { A }} \frac{\text { L.E. } \%}{10}$
B 8
C 50
D 30
E 2


| Question 42 |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| R | $\frac{\text { L.E. } \%}{10}$ |
| A | 5 |
| B | 50 |
| D | 5 |
| E | 20 |


| Question 24 |  |
| :--- | :---: |
| R | $\frac{\text { L.E. \% }}{2}$ |
| A | 1 |
| B | 4 |
| C | 20 |
| D | 35 |
| E | 40 |

Question 28

|  |  |
| :--- | :---: |
| R | $\frac{L . E . \%}{10}$ |
| B | 8 |
| C | 50 |
| D | 30 |
| E | 2 |

Question 32
$\frac{R}{A+D} \frac{L . E . \%}{3}$
B 45
C 12
E 40
$\frac{\text { Question } 39}{\frac{R}{A} \quad \frac{\text { L.E. } \%}{20}}$
B 35
C 2
D 40
E $\quad 3$

Question 43
$\begin{array}{lc}\text { R } & \frac{\text { L.E. \% }}{} \\ \text { A }+E & 5 \\ \text { B } & 10 \\ \text { C } & 50 \\ \text { D } & 35\end{array}$

| Question 25 |  |
| :--- | :---: |
| R | $\frac{\text { L.E. } \%}{6}$ |
| A | 61 |
| C | 35 |
| D | 13 |
| E | 15 |


| Question 29 |  |
| :--- | :---: |
| R | $\frac{\text { L.E. } \%}{2}$ |
| A | 8 |
| B | 8 |
| C | 25 |
| D | 35 |
| E | 30 |

Question 33

|  |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| R | $\frac{\text { L.E. } \%}{1}$ |
| B | 5 |
| C | 24 |
| D | 30 |
| E | 40 |

Question 40
$\frac{\mathrm{R}}{\mathrm{A}} \frac{\text { L.E. } \%}{60}$
B 33
C+D+E 7

| Question 44 |  |
| :--- | ---: |
| R | L.E. \% |
| A | 5 |
| B | 5 |
| C | 25 |
| D | 55 |
| E | 10 |


| Question 26 |  |
| :--- | ---: |
| R | $\frac{\text { L.E. } \%}{20}$ |
| A | 65 |
| C | 5 |
| D+E | 10 |

Question 37

| R | $\frac{\text { L.E. } \%}{5}$ |
| :--- | :---: |
| A | 50 |
| B | 30 |
| C | 45 |
| D | 10 |
| E | 10 |


| Question 41 |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| R | L.E.\% |
| A | 5 |
| B | 30 |
| C | 50 |
| D | 10 |
| E | 5 |

Question 45

| R | $\frac{\text { L.E. } \%}{}$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| A | 40 |
| B | 20 |
| C | 25 |
| D | 5 |
| E | 10 |


| Question 46 |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| R | $\frac{\text { L.E. } \%}{5}$ |  |
| A | 2 |  |
| C | 53 |  |
| D | 30 |  |
| E | 10 |  |

Question 50

| R | L.E. $\%$ |
| :--- | :---: |
| $\frac{A}{A}$ | 20 |
| B | 4 |
| C | 3 |
| D | 11 |
| E | 62 |

Question 54
$\frac{\mathrm{R}}{\mathrm{A}} \frac{\mathrm{L} . \mathrm{E} . \%}{7}$
B 5
C $\quad 1$
D 61
E 26
Question 58
$\frac{\mathrm{R}}{\mathrm{A}} \frac{\text { L.E. } \%}{11}$
B 4
C 38
D $\quad 9$
E 38
Question 63
$\begin{aligned} & \text { R } \\ & \frac{\text { L.E. } \%}{32} \\ & \text { B }\end{aligned} \quad 68$

| Question 47 |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| R | $\frac{\text { L.E. } \%}{15}$ |  |
| B | 15 |  |
| C | 45 |  |
| D | 20 |  |
| E | 5 |  |

Question 51

| $R$ | L.E.\% |
| :--- | :---: |
|  | 26 |
| B | 2 |
| C | 38 |
| D | 4 |
| E | 30 |

Question 55
$\frac{\text { R }}{\text { A }} \frac{\text { L.E. } \%}{20}$
B 26
C 2
D 20
E 32

Question 59
$\frac{R}{\text { R }} \frac{\text { L.E. } \%}{20}$
B 4
C 15
D $\quad 12$
E $\quad 49$


| Question 48 |  |
| :--- | :---: |
| R | $\frac{\text { L.E. } \%}{10}$ |
| A | 10 |
| B | 20 |
| C | 30 |
| D | 35 |
| E | 5 |


| Question 52 |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| R | $\frac{\text { L.E. } \%}{30}$ |  |
| A | 49 |  |
| B | 15 |  |
| C | 5 |  |
| D | 1 |  |
| E | 1 |  |

$$
\text { Question } 56
$$

| R | L.E. $\%$ |
| :--- | :---: |
| A | 3 |
| B | 4 |
| C | 15 |
| D | 49 |
| E | 29 |

\[

\]

\[

\]

| Question 49 |  |
| :--- | :---: |
| R | $\frac{\text { L.E. } \%}{5}$ |
| A | 55 |
| C | 20 |
| D | 10 |
| E | 10 |


| Question 53 |  |
| :--- | :---: |
| R | $\frac{\text { L.E. E }}{14}$ |
| A | 15 |
| B | 15 |
| C | 26 |
| D | 42 |
| E | 3 |

\[

\]

$$
\frac{\text { Question } 66}{\frac{R}{\text { R }} \frac{\text { L.E. } \%}{68}} \begin{aligned}
& \text { B } \\
& 32
\end{aligned}
$$

Question 67
$\frac{R}{\text { A }} \frac{\text { L.E. } \%}{32}$
B 68

## SECTION III

The following table describes the grouping of questions and their responses in the measurement of each capacity indicator.
TABLE F-6

## CAPACITY INDICATOR MEASUREMENT

 BY QUESTION NUMBERCapacity Indicator
Decision Making Capability

Innovativeness

Ability to Manage Time

Communicative Ability
Mobility
Psyche, Ego, Status
Health

Job Security
Rewarding Family and Social Life
Misc/Biographical

Ability Under Stress

Reaction to Conflict

Courage to Commit Resources

Intuition

Desire for Power

Question Numbers
$26,41,42,43,44$
$27,28,29,30,31$

38, 39, 40

23, 24, 25, 32, 33
$9,16,17,19,20,21,47$
$34,35,36,37,46$

49

48
$12,13,45$
$3,4,5,6,7,8,10,11$,
$14,15,18,22$
$50,55,59$
51, 52, 58

53, 54, 57

56
$60,62,63,64,65,66,67$

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

Albers, Henry H., Principles of Management: A Modern Approach, 3rd Edition, John Wiley \& Sons, N.Y., Inc., 1969, pp. 632-638

Batten J. D., Tough-Minded Management. AMA, N.Y., 1963, pp. 183-188
Bayton, James A. and Chapman, Richard C., Transformation of Scientists and Engineers into Managers, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, Washington, D.C., 1972

Bennis, Warren G., "Where Have All the Leaders Gone?" an address given at the Executive Development Days Conference in Reston, Va., Feb 18, 1975

Benson, H., "Your Innate Asset for Combatting Stress," Harvard Business Review, Volume 52, Number 4, July-August 1974, pp. 49-60

Blake and Mouton, The Management Grid, Gulf Publishing Co., Houston, Texas, 1964

Blake, R. R. and Mouton, J. S., Building A Dynamic Corporation Through Grid Organization Development, Addison-Wesley Publishing Co., 1969

Byham, W. C. and Pentecost, R., "The Assessment Center: Identifying Tomorrow's Managers," Personnel, September-October 1970, pp. 17-28 Cribbin, James J., Effective Managerial Leadership, AMA, N.Y., 1972, p. $217+$

Dailey, Charles A., Entrepreneurial Management, Going All Out for Results, McGraw-Hill Book Co., N.Y., 1971, pp. 47-103

Damico, Joseph U., "Developing Executive Talent," Manpower, November 1974
Defense Documentation Center AD 749803, Managerial Success: A Study
of Value and Demographic Correlates, by G. W. England and M. L. Weber, August 1972

Derr, C. Brooklyn, Managing Organizational Conflict: When to Use Collaboration, Bargaining and Power Approaches, Conceptual Working Paper, Naval Postgraduate School, Monterey, 1975

Dooker, M. J. and Marquis, V., The Development of Executive Talent - A Handbook of Management Development Techniques and Case Studies, AMA, N.Y., 1952

Drucker, P. F., Management, Harper \& Row Publishing Co., N.Y., 1974
Drucker, P. F., Preparing Tomorrow's Business Leaders Today,
Prentice-Hall, Inc. Englewood Cliffs, N.J., 1969
Drucker, P. F., The Effective Executive, Harper \& Row Publishing Co., N.Y., 1974

Dunnette, Marvin D., Personnel Selection and Placement, Wadsworth Publishing Co., California, 1966

English, Horace B. and English, Ara C., A Comprehensive Dictionary of Psychological and Psychoanalytical Terms: A Guide to Usage, McKay Co., N.Y., 1958

Fear, Richard A., The Evaluation Interview, McGraw-Hill, N.Y., 1958
Fielder, F. E., "Engineer the Job to Fit the Manager," Harvard Business
Review, September-October 1965, pp. 115-122
Fielder, F. E., "The Trouble With Leadership Training is That It Doesn't
Train Leaders," Psychology Today, February 1973, pp. 24-27
Flory, Charles D., ed. Managers for Tomorrow, New American Library, N. Y., 1971

The "Forbes Sale 500," FORBES, Volume 413, Number 10, 15 May 1974, pp. 217-224

Fulmer, R. M., The New Management, MacMillan Publishing Co., N.Y., pp. 296-316, 320-338, 361-380, 387

Gardner, N. D., Effective Executive Practices, Doubleday and Co., Inc., N.Y., 1963, p. 52

Haas, Frederick C., Executive Obsolescence, AMA, N.Y., 1968, pp. 9-16
Hirschowitz, Ralph G., "The Human Aspects of Managing Transition," Personne1, May-June 1974, p. 8

Jacques, Elliott, Equitable Payment, Heinemann, London, 1970

Jennings, E. E., The Mobile Manager: A Study of the New Generation of
Top Executives, Bureau of Industrial Relations, Graduate School of Business, The University of Michigan, 1967; pp. 6-9, 88-89

Jones, Manley Howe, Executive Decision Making, Richard D. Irwin, Inc., 1962, p. 51+

Katz, R. L., "Skills of an Effective Administrator," Harvard Business Review, Volume 52, Number 5, September-October, 1974

Kazmier, Leonard J., Principles of Management, 2nd Edition, McGraw-Hill Book Co., N.Y., 1969, p. 166+

Kelly, Joe, "Make Conflict Work for You," Hardvard Business Review, July-August, 1970, pp. 103-113

Koontz and $0^{\prime}$ Donnell, C., Principles of Management: An Analysis of Managerial Functions, 5th Edition, McGraw-Hill Book Co., N.Y., 1972; pp. 417-436, 524-555

Laner, S., E.R.F.W. Crossman, and H. T. Baker, Measurement of Responsibility: A Critical Evaluation of Level of Work Measurement
by Time-Span of Discretion, Research Report-Department of Industrial Engineering and Operations Research, University of California, Berkeley, 1969

Leavitt, Harold J., Managerial Psychology, University of Chicago Press, 1958, p. 150+

Levinson, Harry, Executive Stress, Harper \& Row, N.Y., 1970
Lewis, R. F., "Choosing and Using Outside Directors," Harvard Business Review, Volume 52, Number 4, July-August, 1974, p. 70-78

Marvin, Philip, Management Goals: Guidelines and Accountability, Dow-Jones Irwin, Inc., Homewood, Ill., 1968, p. 155+

McCay, J. T., The Management of Time, Prentice-Hall Inc., Englewood Cliffs, N.J., 1971, pp. 31-37

McClellan, D. C., "Business Drive \& National Achievement," Harvard Business Review, July-August, 1962, pp. 99-112

McFarland, D. E., Management Principles and Practices, 4th Edition, MacMillan Publishing Co., N.Y., 1974; pp. 39, 96-110, 270-271, 450-455

McNichols, T. J., Policy Making and Executive Action, McGraw-Hill Book Co., N.Y., 1967

Mintzberg, H., "The Manager's Job: Folklore and Fact," Harvard Business Review, Volume 53, Number 4, July-August, 1975

Naval Postgraduate School, An Approach to the Identification of the Potential Executive, by T. J. Leshko and C. E. Vosseteig, June 1975

Naval Postgraduate School, Contribution Toward Identifying The Developing Executive, by James K. Freeman and Gerald A. Motta, March 1975

Naval Postgraduate School, Enhancement of Research and Development Output Utilization Efficiencies; Linker Concept Methodology in the

Technology Transfer Process, by J. W. Creighton, J. A. Jolly and S. A. Denning, 30 June 1972

Newcomer, M., The Big Business Executive: The Factors That Made Him 1900-1950, Columbia University Press, N.Y., 1955

Oncken, W., Jr., and Wass, D. L., "Management Time: Who's Got the
Monkey," Harvard Business Review, Volume 52, Number 6, NovemberDecember 1974, pp. 75-80

Packard, V., The Status Seekers, David McKay Co., Inc. N.Y., 1959;
pp. 58-66, 194-206
Peter, Lawrence J. and Hull, Raymond, The Peter Principle: Why Things Go Wrong, William Morrow \& Co., Inc., N.Y., 1969, p. 25

Rosenberg, S. L., Self-Analysis of Your Organization, AMACON, 1974 Royal Bank of Canada Monthly Letter, "To Become a Manager," January 1971 Sayles, Leonard R., Managerial Behavior, McGraw-Hill, N.Y., 1964

Schein, Edgar H. and Lippett, Gordon L., "Supervisory Attitudes Toward the Legitimacy of Influencing Subordinates," Journal of Applied Behaviorial Science, Volume 2, Number 2, 1966, pp. 199-209

Schleh, Edward C., Management by Results, McGraw-Hill, N.Y., 1961
Standard \& Poor's Register of Corporations, Directors and Executives, Geographical Index, Standard \& Poor's Corp., N.Y., 1974

Swayne, C. B. and Tucker, W. R., The Effective Entrepreneur, General Learning Press, Morristown, N.J., 1972

Uris, A., Developing Your Executive Skills, McGraw-Hill Book Co., Inc., N.Y., 1955, p. 123

Uris, Auren, The Efficient Executive, McGraw-Hill Book Co., Inc., N.Y., 1957, pp. 269-286

Uris, A., The Management Makers, MacMillan Publishing Co., N.Y., 1962; pp. 50-59, 63-67, 96

Warner, L. W., The Corporation in the Emerging American Society, Harper \& Row Publishers, N.Y., 1962, pp. 47-57

Webster's New World Dictionary, The World Publishing Co., N.Y., 1960
Webster's Third New International Dictionary, Volume's I, II and III, G \& C Merriam Co., 1971

Weisselberg, R. C. and Cowley, J. G., The Executive Strategist, McGraw-Hill Book Co., N.Y., 1969
"What Stress Can Do For You," Fortune, January 1972
Whyte, W. N., Jr., The Organization Man, Doubleday and Co., Inc., Garden City. N.Y., 1956; pp. 77, 155-165, 415-422

Wood, Leland Edward Jr., "The Results and Implications of a Study of Felt Fair Play in a Random Sample of Naval Officers Thesis," Naval Postgraduate School, Monterey, 1973

Wortman, Max S. Jr., and Fred Lutheins, ed. Emerging Concepts in Management, MacMillan Publishing Co., Inc. N.Y., 1975

1. Defense Documentation Center ..... 2
Cameron Station
Alexandria, Virginia 22314
2. Library, Code 0212
Naval Postgraduate School
Monterey, California 93940
3. Department Chairman, Code 55 ..... 1
Department of Operations Research and Administrative Sciences
Naval Postgraduate School
Monterey, California 93940
4. Professor, J. W. Creighton, Code 55cf ..... 10
Department of Operations Research and Administrative Sciences
Naval Postgraduate School
Monterey, California 93940
5. Professor J. Jolly ..... 1
Department of Operations Research and Administrative Sciences
Naval Postgraduate School
Monterey, California 93940
6. Rear Admiral Rowland G. Freeman, USN ..... 3
Commander
Naval Weapons Center
China Lake, California 93555
7. Rear Admiral David M. Altwegg, USN ..... 3
Commander
Pacific Missile Test Center
Point Mugu, California 93042
8. Commander, ..... 3
Naval Aviation Integrated Logistic Support Center Patuxent River, Maryland 20670
9. Captain James J. Clarkin, USN ..... 3
Commanding Officer
Naval Personnel Research and Development Center
San Diego, California 92132
No. Copies
10. Naval Air Systems Command ..... 4
Code 990
Washington, D. C. 20391
11. Professor S. Laner ..... 1
611 Scenic
Berkeley, California 94709
12. Commander Thomas J. Leshko, USN ..... 3
Executive Officer

$$
\text { V. P. }-40
$$

F.P.O. San Francisco, California 96601
13. Lieutenant Craig E. Vosseteig, USN ..... 3
NAVMMACPAC
San Diego, California 92132
14. Howard W. Rowe ..... 3
Code 3451
Pacific Missile Test Center
Point Mugu, California 93042
15. James C. Rudeen ..... 3
Code 355
Naval Weapons Center
China Lake, California 93555
16. John W. Wenke ..... 3
Code ILS-430
Naval Aviation Integrated Logistic Support Center Patuxent River, Maryland 20670
17. Theodore E. Elsasser ..... 1
Naval Air Propulsion Test Center Trenton, New Jersey 08628
18. D. R. Hansen ..... 1
1114 Adirondack Drive Ottawa, Ontario, K2C 2V1




[^0]:    
    ${ }^{1}$ This table displays the results of the comparison of the responses within each population to those responses based upon management
    literature. The test used was Chi-Square $\left(x^{2}\right)$ with a confidence level of $95 \%$. The table shows the $\chi^{2}$ critical value at $95 \%$ confidence and whether the test show the responses were different (DIFF).

